

National Catholic Educational Association

Bulletin

August 1964

Proceedings and Addresses / 61st Annual Meeting



Catholic Education and National Needs

MEMBERSHIP IN THE ASSOCIATION

All who are interested in the welfare of Catholic educational work are invited to become members of the National Catholic Educational Association. It is the desire of the Executive Board that the membership be increased so that the organization may represent a powerful influence in favor of religious education in America.

Support: The expenses of the Association are raised by the annual dues of the members, and by contributions from those who have taken a particular interest in the work. Membership dues are as follows:

Sustaining Membership: Anyone desiring to receive the publications of many departments of the Association may become a sustaining member. The annual fee for such membership is \$25.00.

Major Seminary Dues: Each Seminary in the Major Seminary Department pays an annual fee of \$25.00.

Minor Seminary Dues: Each Minor Seminary in the Minor Seminary Department pays an annual fee of \$25.00.

College and University Dues: *Constituent Membership*—Each college or university with an enrollment of 1,500 or over pays an annual fee of \$150.00; institutions with enrollment between 1,000 and 1,499 pay \$125.00 annually; institutions with enrollment between 500 and 999 pay \$100.00 annually; institutions with enrollment of less than 500 pay \$75.00 annually. *Associate Membership*—Institutions holding Associate Membership pay \$25.00 per year.

Newman Foundation Dues: Each Newman Foundation member pays an annual fee of \$25.00.

School Superintendents Dues: Each Superintendent in the School Superintendents Department pays an annual fee of \$10.00.

Secondary School Dues: Each secondary school with an enrollment of 1,000 or more pays an annual fee of \$100.00; schools with enrollment between 400 and 999 pay \$50.00 annually; those with enrollment of less than 400 pay \$25.00 annually.

Elementary School Dues: Each institutional member in the Elementary School Department pays an annual fee of \$10.00.

Special Education Dues: Each institutional member in the Special Education Department pays an annual fee of \$5.00.

Supervisors Dues: Each member of the Supervisors Section pays an annual fee of \$10.00.

Individual Membership: Anyone interested in the work of Catholic education may become a member of the Association. Individual membership, however, should not be a substitute for institutional membership; for example, staff members of Catholic educational institutions may become individual members, but not in place of institutional membership of their schools. The annual fee for general individual membership is \$5.00.

Publications: The Association issues a quarterly *Bulletin* published in February, May, August, and November of each year. The August *Bulletin* includes the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting. These *Bulletins* and some special publications are sent to all members. Departmental publications go to members of the various departments.

General Offices of the National Catholic Educational Association 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036

The Bulletin is published quarterly by the National Catholic Educational Association. Subscription price, \$3.00 per year. Annual individual membership fee in the Association including *Bulletin*, \$5.00. Office of the Executive Secretary, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036. *The National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* is indexed in *The Education Index* of the H. W. Wilson Co. as well as in *The Catholic Periodical Index*. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION
BULLETIN

Catholic Education
and National Needs



REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES AT
THE SIXTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE
NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., MARCH 31-APRIL 3, 1964

EDITED BY MARY IRWIN

Nihil obstat:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt

CENSOR DEPUTATUS

Imprimatur:

✠ PATRICK A. O'BOYLE

ARCHBISHOP OF WASHINGTON

JUNE 30, 1964

The *nihil obstat* and *imprimatur* are official declarations that a book or pamphlet is free of doctrinal or moral error. No implication is contained therein that those who have granted the *nihil obstat* and the *imprimatur* agree with the content, opinions, or statements expressed.

HV1626

N

copy 1

NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Officers for the Year 1964-65

General

President General: Most Rev. John P. Cody, D.D., New Orleans, Louisiana

Vice Presidents General

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frank M. Schneider, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Very Rev. Msgr. Edmond A. Fournier, Bloomfield, Michigan
Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Carl J. Ryan, Cincinnati, Ohio
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edmund J. Goebel, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul E. Campbell, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Sylvester J. Holbel, Orchard Park, New York

Executive Secretary: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, Washington, D.C.

General Executive Board

Rev. Thomas W. Coyle, C.S.S.R., Oconomowoc, Wisconsin
Very Rev. James A. Laubacher, S.S., Roland Park, Baltimore, Maryland
Very Rev. Msgr. John E. Murphy, Little Rock, Arkansas
Very Rev. Donald J. Ryan, C.M., St. Louis, Missouri
Very Rev. Herman Romoser, O.S.B., St. Meinrad, Indiana
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis E. Riedel, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Brother Gregory, F.S.C., New York, N. Y.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, Louisville, Kentucky
Dr. William H. Conley, Bridgeport, Connecticut
Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate, Columbus, Ohio
Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Edwin Stuardi, Mobile, Alabama
Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, St. Louis, Missouri
Very Rev. Msgr. Henry Gardner, Kansas City, Kansas
Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X., Newton Highlands, Massachusetts
Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. Leo Keaveny, Little Falls, Minnesota
Sister Marie Theresa, S.C., New York, N. Y.
Rt. Rev. Msgr. William E. McManus, Chicago, Illinois
Sister Mary Edward, P.B.V.M., Dubuque, Iowa
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Daniel Kirwin, Vienna, West Virginia
Rt. Rev. Msgr. James E. Hoflich, St. Louis, Missouri
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix Newton Pitt, Louisville, Kentucky

Major Seminary Department

President; Rev. Thomas W. Coyle, C.S.S.R., Oconomowoc, Wisconsin

Vice President; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Riley, Brighton, Massachusetts

Secretary; Rev. Conrad Falk, O.S.B., Conception, Missouri

General Executive Board

Very Rev. James A. Laubacher, S.S., Baltimore, Maryland
Very Rev. Msgr. John E. Murphy, Little Rock, Arkansas

Minor Seminary Department

President: Very Rev. Donald J. Ryan, C.M., St. Louis, Missouri

Vice President: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Ralph M. Miller, Buffalo, New York

Secretary: Very Rev. Msgr. John O'Donnell, Chicago, Illinois

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis E. Riedel, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Very Rev. Herman Romoser, O.S.B., St. Meinrad, Indiana

College and University Department

President: Brother Gregory, F.S.C., New York, N. Y.

Vice President: Very Rev. Michael P. Walsh, S.J., Chestnut Hills, Massachusetts

Secretary: Dr. Richard A. Matre, Chicago, Illinois

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, Louisville, Kentucky

Dr. William H. Conley, Bridgeport, Connecticut

Department Executive Committee

Ex officio Members

The President, Vice President, and Secretary

Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri. Vice President General representing College and University Department

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, Louisville, Kentucky. Department Representative on General Executive Board

Dr. William H. Conley, Bridgeport, Connecticut. Past President and Department Representative on General Executive Board

Dr. Raymond McCoy, Cincinnati, Ohio, Secretary of Committee on Graduate Study

Very Rev. Gerald E. Dupont, S.S.E., Winooski, Vermont, Secretary of Committee on Membership

Sister Mary Lorraine, O.S.F., Winona, Minnesota, Editor, *College Newsletter*

Non-voting Members

Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J., Washington, D.C., Associate Secretary

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Julius W. Haun, Winona, Minnesota

Rev. Cyril F. Meyer, C.M., Jamaica, N.Y.

Brother A. Potamian, F.S.C., New York, N.Y.

Brother Bonaventure Thomas, F.S.C., New York, N.Y.

General Members

Sister M. Augustine, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin	}	1961-65
Very Rev. Lawrence V. Britt, S.J., Detroit, Michigan		
Dr. James A. Hart, Chicago, Illinois		
Rev. Joseph Hogan, C.M., Jamaica, New York		

Very Rev. A. William Crandell, S.J., Spring Hill, Alabama	}	1962-66
Very Rev. William F. Kelley, S.J., Milwaukee, Wisconsin		
Sister Joan Marie, S.N.J.M., Oakland, California		
Very Rev. Brian J. Egan, O.S.B., University Park, Pennsylvania		

Most Rev. John J. Dougherty, South Orange, New Jersey	}	1963-67
Sister Mary Josetta, R.S.M., Washington, D.C.		
Very Rev. Charles S. Casassa, S.J., Los Angeles, California		
Sister Mary Concetta, O.S.U., Louisville, Kentucky		

Sister Anastasia Maria, I.H.M., Immaculata, Pennsylvania	}	1964-68
Rt. Rev. Msgr. James P. Shannon, St. Paul, Minnesota		
Very Rev. James F. Maguire, S.J., Chicago, Illinois		
Rev. V. J. DeLeers, O.Praem., West De Pere, Wisconsin		

College and University Department—Continued

Regional Unit Members

Very Rev. Michael P. Walsh, S.J., Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts	}	New England
Very Rev. Richard H. Sullivan, C.S.C., North Easton, Massachusetts		
Very Rev. J. A. Klekotka, O.A.S., Villanova, Pennsylvania	}	Eastern
Sister Marie Christine, G.N.S.H., Buffalo, New York		
Sister Mary Eugene, O.P., New Orleans, Louisiana	}	Southern
Very Rev. John A. Oetgen, O.S.B., Belmont, North Carolina		
Rev. Carl A. Hangartner, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri	}	Midwestern
Dr. Siegmund A. E. Betz, Cincinnati, Ohio		
Sister M. Jean Frances, O.P., Edmunds, Washington	}	Northwestern
Very Rev. Paul E. Waldschmidt, C.S.C., Portland, Oregon		
Sister M. William, I.H.M., Los Angeles, California	}	Southwestern
Rev. Herman J. Hauck, S.J., San Francisco, California		

Section on Teacher Education

Chairman: Sister Rosemary, D.C., Emmitsburg, Maryland
Vice Chairman: Rev. E. J. LaMal, O.Praem., West De Pere, Wisconsin
Secretary: Sister Maureen, S.S.N.D., Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Sister Formation Section

Chairman: Rev. Mother Mary Regina, R.S.M., Bethesda, Maryland
Vice Chairman: Rev. Mother Kathryn Marie, C.S.C., Notre Dame, Indiana
Executive Secretary: Sister Annette, C.S.J., Washington, D.C.

Newman Education Section

Chairman: Rev. Richard Butler, O.P., Chicago, Illinois
Vice Chairman: Very Rev. Msgr. Gerard Glynn, St. Louis, Missouri
Secretary: Rev. James T. Healey, New Haven, Connecticut

School Superintendents Department

President: Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate, Columbus, Ohio
Vice President: Very Rev. Msgr. R. C. Ulrich, Omaha, Nebraska
Secretary: Very Rev. Msgr. James Donohue, Baltimore, Maryland

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Edwin Stuardi, Mobile, Alabama
Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, St. Louis, Missouri

School Superintendents Department—Continued

Department Executive Committee

Ex officio members

The President, Vice President, and Secretary
Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Edwin Stuardi, Mobile, Alabama
Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, St. Louis, Missouri
Rt. Rev. Msgr. A. W. Behrens, Associate Secretary, Washington, D.C.

General Members

Very Rev. Msgr. M. F. McAuliffe, Kansas City-St. Joseph, Missouri
Rev. William M. Roche, Rochester, New York
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Henry C. Bezou, New Orleans, Louisiana
Rev. John Meyers, Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas
Rev. Richard Kleiber, Green Bay, Wisconsin

Supervisors Section

Chairman: Sister M. Celine, O.S.F., Rockford, Illinois
Vice Chairman: Sister M. De Lourdes, C.S.A, Cleveland, Ohio
Secretary: Sister Francis Eileen, S.L., Loretto, Colorado

Ex officio members

President and Associate Secretary of the Department
Associate Secretary, Secondary School Department:
Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
Associate Secretary, Elementary School Department:
Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.

ADVISORY BOARD

Community Supervisors: Sister Hilda Marie, O.P., Chicago, Illinois
Brother Bernard Gregory, F.M.S., Bronx, New York
Diocesan Supervisors: Sister M. Bernard, O.L.M., Charleston, South Carolina
Sister M. Patrice, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Special Subject Supervisor: Sister M. Antonine, C.S.J., Milton, Massachusetts
Director of Education for Religious Community: Rev. Lorenzo Reed, S.J., New York, New York
Director of Teacher Education: Sister M. Philomene, S.L., Webster Groves, Missouri
President of Department of School Superintendents: Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate, Columbus, Ohio

Secondary School Department

President: Very Rev. Msgr. Henry Gardner, Kansas City, Kansas
Vice President: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Doogan, Seattle, Washington
Secretary: Brother Edwin Goerdts, S.M., St. Louis, Missouri

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. Leo Keaveny, Little Falls, Minnesota
Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X., Newton Highlands, Massachusetts

Secondary School Department—Continued

Department Executive Committee

Ex officio members

The President, Vice President, and Secretary
 Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edmund J. Goebel, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. Leo Keaveny, Little Falls, Minnesota
 Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X., Newton Highlands, Massachusetts
 Rev. C. Albert Koob, O. Praem., Washington, D.C., Associate Secretary

General members

Rev. Joseph T. O'Keefe, Yonkers, New York
 Rev. Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J., New York, New York
 Rev. Joseph Lynn, O.S.F.S., Wilmington, Delaware
 Rev. John E. O'Connell, O.P., Dallas, Texas
 Rev. Gerard Benson, O. Carm., Houston, Texas
 Rev. John Sullivan, S.J., Chicago, Illinois
 Rev. Cuthbert Soukup, O.S.B., Collegeville, Minnesota
 Brother Bernard Gregory, F.M.S., Bronx, New York
 Brother Thaddeus, C.F.X., Brooklyn, New York
 Brother John Jansen, S.M., Dayton, Ohio
 Brother Alfonso Comeau, C.S.C., Gates Mills, Ohio
 Brother John Darby, S.M., Chester, Pennsylvania
 Brother Joseph McKenna, F.S.C.H., West Roxbury, Massachusetts
 Brother Jude Aloysius, F.S.C., Lockport, Illinois
 Brother C. O'Donnell, F.S.C.H., Butte, Montana
 Brother J. Stephen, F.S.C., Memphis, Tennessee
 Sister M. Elaine, S.S.N.D., Lake Charles, Louisiana
 Sister M. Elizabeth, S.L., Denver, Colorado
 Sister Francis Inez, S.S.J., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
 Sister M. Hildegardis, C.S.C., Salt Lake City, Utah
 Sister M. Patrice, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Sister M. Xavier, O.P., River Forest, Illinois
 Sister M. Paulita, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Sister M. Jerome, O.S.U., Youngstown, Ohio

Regional Unit Members

Brother Marcellus, C.F.X., Westwood, Massachusetts Rev. Thomas E. Lawton, C.S.C., North Easton, Massachusetts	}	New England
Rev. Joseph C. Hilbert, Lebanon, Pennsylvania Brother Benjamin Benedict, F.S.C., Lincroft, New Jersey	}	Eastern
Rev. John A. Elliott, Memphis, Tennessee Rev. Walter C. McCauley, S.J., Dallas, Texas	}	Southern
Brother Francis Haug, S.M., Belleville, Illinois Rev. David Murphy, O. Carm., Mundelein, Illinois	}	Midwestern
Rev. Joseph E. Perri, S.J., Portland, Oregon Sister John Marian, S.N.J.M., Marylhurst, Oregon	}	Northwestern
Brother Ignatius Kenny, F.S.C., San Francisco, California Rev. Richard Maher, S.J., San José, California	}	Southwestern
Brother Charles Ehrenfeld, S.M., Honolulu Sister Catherine Therese, C.S.J., Kailua	}	Hawaii

Elementary School Department

President: Sister Marie Theresa, S.C., New York City, N.Y.

Vice President: Very Rev. Msgr. James Clyne, Los Angeles, California

Secretary: Miss Madonna Wach, Dayton, Ohio

General Executive Board

Sister Marie Theresa, S.C., New York City, N.Y.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. William E. McManus, Chicago, Illinois

Sister Mary Edward, P.B.V.M., Dubuque, Iowa

Department Executive Committee

Ex officio members

The President, Vice President, and Secretary

Rt. Rev. Msgr. William E. McManus, Chicago, Illinois

Sister Mary Edward, P.B.V.M., Dubuque, Iowa

Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D., Washington, D.C., Associate Secretary

Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D., Washington, D.C., Assistant Secretary

General Members

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Armand E. Cyr, Portland, Maine

Very Rev. Msgr. J. William Lester, Fort Wayne, Indiana

Rev. J. F. McManus, Charleston, South Carolina

Sister Mary Edward, S.S.J., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Sister Eugene Joseph, S.S.J., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Sister Francis Eileen, S.L., Loretto, Colorado

1961-65

Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas W. Lyons, Washington, D.C.

Sister M. Celine, O.S.B., North Miami, Florida

Sister Sarah, S.C.L., Helena, Montana

Sister M. Virgine, I.H.M., Detroit, Michigan

1962-66

Very Rev. Msgr. John A. Lynch, Burlington, Vermont

Brother Bernard Peter, F.S.C., New York City, N.Y.

Sister Anilla, C.S.S.F., Midwest City, Oklahoma

Sister James Bernard, O.P., Oak Lawn, Illinois

1963-67

Rev. Daniel Brent, Rochester, New York

Rev. Robert Schulzetenberg, St. Cloud, Minnesota

Brother Arthur Philip, F.S.C., New York City, N.Y.

Sister Francis Regis, C.S.J., Milton, Massachusetts

Sister M. Helen, O.P., Los Angeles, California

Sister Jean Clare, O.P., Rockville Centre, New York

Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M., Washington, D.C.

Sister Romana, O.S.P., New Orleans, Louisiana

Sister Theonella, C.D.P., San Antonio, Texas

1964-68

Special Education Department

President: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Daniel Kirwin, Wheeling, West Virginia

Vice President: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Sylvester J. Holbel, Buffalo, New York

Secretary: Sister Serena, New York, N.Y.

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix Newton Pitt, Louisville, Kentucky

Rt. Rev. James E. Hoflich, St. Louis, Missouri

Special Education Department—Continued

Department Executive Committee

Ex officio members

The President, Vice President, and Secretary
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix Newton Pitt, Louisville, Kentucky
Rt. Rev. Msgr. James E. Hoffich, St. Louis, Missouri
Very Rev. Msgr. Elmer H. Behrmann, St. Louis, Missouri, Associate Secretary

General Members

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Henry C. Bezou, New Orleans, Louisiana
Sister Joseph Mary, S.N.D., Washington, D.C.
Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. O'Brien, Kansas City, Missouri
Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. Voight, Yonkers, New York
Rev. Francis R. LoBianco, Newark, New Jersey
Sister Celine, Greensburg, Pennsylvania
Sister Ann Columba, Brooklyn, New York
Sister Mary Esther, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Vocation Section

Chairman: Rev. William J. Martin, Toledo, Ohio

Vice Chairman: Rev. Francis A. McKay, M.M., Maryknoll, New York

Secretary: Brother Eymard Salzman, C.S.C., Notre Dame, Indiana

Advisory Board

Very Rev. Msgr. Vincent J. Howard, Detroit, Michigan
Rev. Raymond Dolan, O. Carm., New York, N.Y.
Brother Donald, O.F.M., Brooklyn, New York
Sister M. Patricia, R.S.M., Omaha, Nebraska
Sister M. Innocence, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin

NCEA HEADQUARTERS ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Executive Secretary: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt

Associate Secretary, Major and Minor Seminary Departments: Position to be filled

Associate Secretary, College and University Department: Position to be filled

Associate Secretary, School Superintendents Department: Rt. Rev. Msgr. A. W. Behrens

Associate Secretary, Secondary School Department: Rev. C. Albert Koob, O. Praem.

Evaluation Consultant, Secondary School Department: Brother E. Anthony, F.S.C.

Associate Secretary, Elementary School Department: Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.

Assistant Secretary, Elementary School Department: Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D.

Associate Secretary, Special Education Department: Very Rev. Msgr. Elmer H. Behrmann

Administrative Assistant for Management and Personnel: Miss Nancy Brewer

Administrative Assistant for Coordination of Program and Research: Mrs. Winifred R. Long

Research Consultant: Sister M. Florence, O.S.F.

Secretary, International Student Program: Miss Mary Anne Sigler

Convention and Exhibit Manager: Mr. Joseph O'Donnell

Contents

NCEA Officers and Administrative Staff iii
Introduction xvi

PART 1: NCEA ANNUAL REPORTS

Meetings of the Executive Board: Minutes: 1963-64 1
Report of the Executive Secretary 13

PART 2: GENERAL SESSIONS

Sermon. Pontifical Dialogue Low Mass. *The Most Rev. Archbishop Celestine J. Damiano, D.D.* 21
Catholic Education and National Needs. *The Most Rev. John J. Dougherty, D.D.* 23
The Layman and the Schools. John W. McDevitt 29
The Interdependence of Housing and Education. Robert C. Weaver 37

Proceedings and Reports
General Meetings: Minutes. *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt* 42

PART 3: MAJOR SEMINARY DEPARTMENT

The Contribution the Behavioral Sciences Can Make in Seminary Training. *Rev. Andrew M. Greeley* 47
Modern Science and the Relevance of Scholastic Philosophy. *Very Rev. Benedict W. Ashley, O.P.* 54
The Intellectual Formation of the Future Priest. *Rev. Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.* 58
The Cultural Formation of the Future Priest. *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert C. Wolff, Ph.D.* 68
Differentiated Discipline in the Seminary. *Rev. Eugene C. Kennedy, M.M., Ph.D.* 79
Differentiated Seminary Discipline. *Rev. Paul F. D'Arcy, M.M.* 85
The Aggiornamento of Seminaries. *Rev. Peter Riga* 89

Proceedings and Reports
Minutes: 1964 Meetings 96
Officers, 1964-65 102

PART 4: MINOR SEMINARY DEPARTMENT

Perseverance in the Seminary: Problems and Remedies. <i>Most Rev. John J. Wright, D.D.</i>	103
The Guidance Counselor and the Spiritual Director: The Distinct Role of Each <i>Rev. William C. Bier, S.J.</i>	112
College Entrance Policies. <i>R. M. Keefe</i>	121

Proceedings and Reports

Resolutions	126
Officers, 1964-65	127

PART 5: COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT

National Needs and American Higher Education. <i>Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education</i>	128
The Responsibility of American Catholic Higher Education in Meeting National Needs. <i>Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J.</i>	134
The Realization of the Purposes of Catholic Education on the Catholic Campus. <i>Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan</i>	143
The Cultural Contribution of the Newman Apostolate to Secular Higher Education. <i>Rev. Richard E. Butler, O.P.</i>	148
Catholic Colleges and the Academic Facilities Bill of 1963. <i>Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J.</i>	155
Moral, Religious, and Spiritual Formation of Students—A National Need. <i>Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Murphy</i>	162
<i>Sister Mary John, S.S.J.</i>	162
Bible Devotions and National Needs. <i>Antony Mullaney, O.S.B.</i>	165

Sister Formation Section

Understanding the Interracial Question: An Element in Sister Formation. <i>Rev. William J. Kenealy, S.J.</i>	167
Understanding the Interracial Question: An Element in Sister Formation. <i>Matthew Ahmann</i>	173
Relating the Problem of Poverty in the Modern World to Spiritual Formation. <i>Sister Mary Daniel, S.N.D. de N.</i>	179

Committee on Graduate Study

Impact: Federal Government Programs on Catholic Graduate Schools. <i>Rev. Jerome J. Marchetti, S.J.</i>	182
---	-----

Section on Teacher Education

The Why and How of Organizing a Five-Year Program of Teacher Education. <i>Rev. Darrell F. X. Finnegan, S.J., Ph.D.</i>	184
Catholic Teacher Education and Social Leadership. <i>Very Rev. William Ferree, S.M., Ph.D.</i>	190
Proceedings of Business Meeting: Relationship of the Section on Teacher Education to the College and University Department. <i>Brother Louis J. Faerber, S.M.</i>	198

International Student Program

Foreign Student Advising on the Catholic Campus. Rev. Gerard F. Yates, S.J.....	200
The Needs of Foreign Students. Rev. Peter De La Garza	205
The Community and the Foreign Student. Thomas Quigley	207
English and the Foreign Student. Robert Lado	210

Proceedings and Reports

Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting	213
Officers, 1964-65	219

PART 6: SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS DEPARTMENT

Education and African Development. The Honorable G. Mennen Williams	221
Resolutions	225
Associate Secretary's Remarks	226

Meeting of Catholic Lay People

Federal Aid—1964. William B. Ball	228
How Catholic Schools Look to Parents: What the Public Should Know. Mrs. Charles J. O'Neil	233
Perspective on Catholic Education: What the Public Sees and Hears. Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.	241

Proceedings and Reports

Minutes of the Annual Meeting, October 21-24, 1963	244
Resolutions	247
Report of Nominating Committee	248
Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting, October 21, 1963	248
Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, March 31, 1964	249
Resolutions	251
Officers, 1964-65	252

PART 7: SECONDARY SCHOOL DEPARTMENT

A Positive View of Catholic Secondary Education in the Light of Today's Crisis. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas P. Duffy, S.T.D., Ph.D.	253
The Essential Role and Formation of the Teacher of High School Religion. Rev. Joseph A. Novak, S.J.	260
Approaches to the Old Testament for High School Catechists and Students. Rev. Aldo J. Tos	262
The Mystery of Christ. Rev. Joseph D. Dillon	270
The Newman Apostolate and the High School Graduate. Rev. Egbert H. Donovan, O.S.B.	273
Staff Utilization—Implications for Administrators. Philip R. Pitruzzello	280
Use of Community Resources and Personnel. Rev. Thomas J. Peterman	284
Advanced Summer Schools for High School Students: The Program at Clayton High School, St. Louis. Rev. Gerald R. Sheahan, S.J.	290
Educational TV—What One School Is Doing With Closed-Circuit Television. Rev. Anthony J. Dougherty, O.S.F.S.	291

Scheduling To Accommodate Large Enrollments. <i>Brother Laurentian Peter, F.S.C.</i>	293
--	-----

Proceedings and Reports

The Curriculum Advisory Committees	298
A Position Paper on English in the Catholic Secondary School. <i>Rev. James E. Farrell, S.J.</i>	298
Testing in Foreign Languages. Summary of Report of Working Committee	302
Summaries: Advisory Committees	302
Report of the Committee on Regional Units. <i>Brother Jude Aloysius, F.S.C.</i>	304
Officers, 1964-65	306

PART 8: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DEPARTMENT

Castro Cuba and Latin America. <i>James B. Donovan</i>	308
Physical Fitness for National Strength. <i>Ralph Owens</i>	314
What Are the Facts? A Progress Report on the Study of Catholic Education <i>Reginald A. Neuwein</i>	318
What's New in Significant Research and Experimentation in Catholic Elementary Education? <i>Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.</i>	325

Proceedings and Reports

Officers, 1964-65	336
-------------------------	-----

PART 9: SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Catholic Special Education—A National Need. <i>The Most Rev. John J. Graham, D.D.</i>	338
Preventive Mental Hygiene for Children. <i>Robert J. McAllister, Ph.D., M.D.</i>	342
The Educational and Social Needs of the Blind. <i>Rev. Thomas J. Carroll</i>	353
Educational and Social Needs of the Deaf. <i>Peter J. Owsley</i>	356
Programs for Training Teachers of the Mentally Retarded. <i>Chris J. De Prospo, Ed.D.</i>	361

Proceedings and Reports

Officers, 1964-65	367
-------------------------	-----

PART 10: VOCATION SECTION

The Vocation Apostolate—An Integrated Effort. <i>The Most Rev. Celestine J. Damiano, D.D.</i>	368
The Morality of Psychological Testing of Vocation Prospects. <i>Rev. Robert Howard Sweeney, C.S.C.</i>	370

Modern Youth and the Vocational Challenge. <i>Brother Germanus Burns, C.S.C.</i>	381
Pastoral Approach in the Vocation Apostolate. <i>Rev. John R. Madden</i>	390
The Personality Assessment of Candidates for the Priesthood and the Religious Life. <i>Walter J. Coville, Ph.D.</i>	396
The Sister in the Modern World. <i>Sister Maureen O'Keefe, S.S.N.D.</i>	409
The Mission of the Theresians. <i>Mrs. Charles H. Lovette</i>	411

Proceedings and Reports

Officers, 1964-65	415
-------------------------	-----

APPENDIXES

I. Financial Report, 1963	417
II. Constitution and Bylaws of the National Catholic Educational Association	420

INDEX	423
-------------	-----

Introduction

OFTTIME HOST to the Catholic educators of America, Atlantic City once again warmly and efficiently opened all its facilities to welcome the 61st Annual Convention of the NCEA. The unusually large number of early arrivals who came to stroll on the boardwalk on that balmy Easter Sunday, March 29, gave evidence of a large convention as well as a successful one. And so it was. By Friday it was discovered that a new enrollment record had been set for NCEA conventions with a total of 17,688 registered participants.

Convention Hall bulged with overflow crowds for the opening general meeting at which time His Excellency the Most Reverend Archbishop Celestine J. Damiano, D.D., Bishop of Camden, cordially welcomed the delegates. His Excellency the Most Reverend John J. Dougherty, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop of Newark and President of Seton Hall University, set the theme for most of the discussions when his keynote address touched on the idea of crisis in Catholic education. In accordance with the theme "Catholic Education and National Needs," Bishop Dougherty stressed the contribution that Christian humanism must make to America and the world. He reminded the delegates that "the nation must continue to receive a supply of dedicated people which are its very soul." To this task Catholic educators must ever bend their efforts.

This was the convention which fairly exploded with dynamic interest in the vital question "Are parochial schools the answer?" The air had been charged by reason of recently published articles questioning the quality and indeed the need of Catholic parochial education. While no startling changes in policy resulted from the discussion, one thing is certain, many went home with strong convictions that much work lay ahead. Storms were yet to be encountered, but the school system would not only stay with us but emerge as an even more efficient arm of the Church in America than it had been previously. This was the year that more emphasis was laid upon the problem of Catholic youth in public schools and universities. Suddenly the scope of Catholic education was widened to include consideration of problems touching on the needs of all Catholic youth and the needs of the entire nation.

The usual happy boardwalk scenes were plentiful as religious of every community met old friends and acquaintances. Lay teachers were more in abundance than ever before. One could walk for miles on the boardwalk and spot happy groups of sisters dining by the window of each seaside restaurant. Relaxation out of sessions, vigor in the sessions—such would best describe the 61st Annual Convention.

Words of thanks must be here recorded for all who contributed to the success of this convention. His Excellency the Most Reverend John P. Cody, D.D. as President General deserves much credit for his active and inspiring leadership. The local committee under the direction of Rt. Rev. Msgr. Charles P. McGarry and Reverend William G. Mark did everything possible to assure the comfort of the delegates. As usual, Monsignor Hochwalt, Mr. Joseph O'Donnell, and Miss Nancy Brewer, all of the national office, did a superb job on the general organization.

Meetings of the Executive Board: Minutes

Sheraton Palace Hotel, San Francisco, California, June 13, 1963

THE MEETING of the Executive Board of Directors was opened with prayer at 10 A.M. by His Excellency, the Most Reverend John P. Cody, President General, National Catholic Educational Association.

Other members of the Board present were: Brother E. Anthony, F.S.C., Philadelphia, Pa.; Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X., Newton Highlands, Mass.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul E. Campbell, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Dr. William H. Conley, Bridgeport, Conn.; Rev. Thomas W. Coyle, C.S.S.R., Oconomowoc, Wis.; Very Rev. Armand H. Desautels, A.A., Worcester, Mass.; Very Rev. Vincent C. Dore, O.P., Providence, R.I.; Sister Mary Edward, P.B.V.M., Dubuque, Iowa; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Anthony Egging, Grand Island, Neb.; Very Rev. Msgr. Edmond A. Fournier, Detroit, Mich.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Paul Haverty, New York, N.Y.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. James E. Hofflich, St. Louis, Mo.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, Louisville, Ky.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. Leo Keaveny, Little Falls, Minn.; Rev. Daniel Kirwin, Wheeling, W.Va.; Rev. Richard Kleiber, Green Bay, Wis.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. William E. McManus, Chicago, Ill.; Very Rev. Msgr. John E. Murphy, Little Rock, Ark.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix Newton Pitt, Louisville, Ky.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis E. Riedel, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Carl J. Ryan, Cincinnati, Ohio; Very Rev. Donald J. Ryan, C.M., St. Louis, Mo.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frank M. Schneider, Milwaukee, Wis.; and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, Washington, D.C. Mr. Joseph O'Donnell, Washington, D.C., was also present.

The minutes of the last meeting were accepted with one amendment: the name of Very Rev. Msgr. Raymond P. Rigney, New York, N.Y., which had been omitted, was added to the list of members of the World's Fair Committee for the Catholic Education Exhibit.

The Executive Secretary introduced the new members and extended greetings from absent members of the Board.

The President General appointed a committee consisting of Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis E. Riedel, *chairman*; Sister Mary Edward, P.B.V.M., and Rev. Daniel Kirwin, to review the annual audit of the Association accounts and the financial statement. Copies of the financial statement were provided the members. The audit committee reported that the financial audit and statement were found in good order in every detail and recommended that the Board accept these reports. The Board voted to accept the reports.

The Executive Secretary reported that the staff in the national office numbers approximately 28 people. Efforts are still being made to identify an Associate Secretary for the Seminary Departments. It was suggested that a committee of seminary men assist the Executive Secretary in his efforts to secure an Associate Secretary. The Executive Secretary stated that he would be most grateful for the assistance, and the Board voted to establish a com-

mittee of members of the Major and Minor Seminary Departments to assist by suggesting names of qualified men for this position. It was reported later that this committee would be composed of the members of the executive committees of the Major and Minor Seminary Departments.

The Executive Secretary reported that the national office is still working on the affiliation of other organizations with NCEA and that a report should be ready by the next meeting.

The Executive Secretary suggested that plans and discussion of the proposed new building be postponed until after the drive for funds for the Catholic Education Exhibit at the World's Fair is completed. The Board accepted this suggestion.

A report on the small NCEA exhibit was presented by Mr. O'Donnell. In the two years of its existence the exhibit has been used at ten diocesan meetings, and approximately twenty-six others have requested it. A letter will be sent out this summer inviting school superintendents to make use of the exhibit at their diocesan meetings.

Dr. Conley presented the report of the Evaluation Committee for the 1963 convention. He stated that most of the suggestions from previous evaluations had been carried out and that there were few specific recommendations by evaluators or delegates this year. In general, the 1963 convention was enthusiastically received; 43 percent of the delegates polled by mail rated the convention excellent and 46 percent rated it as good. Dr. Conley pointed out certain problems which had been discussed by the Evaluation Committee: (1) The question of how much duplication of other educational meetings should be included in the NCEA Convention. This varies from department to department, since college people attend many more educational meetings than do the elementary and secondary people. (2) The question of the types of programs used by the various departments, such as debates, floor discussions, etc. (3) The increasing necessity to hold some meetings outside the main convention facility. (The Evaluation Committee did not favor complete separation of whole departments because this tends to splinter the Association, but in view of the growth of the Association in recent years, the Committee recognizes the need to hold some sessions outside the convention hall or main meeting building.) The Committee also suggested that there be some carry-over of evaluators from the departments from year to year, and that where possible evaluators be appointed who have attended educational meetings previously. The Board then voted to accept the report of the Evaluation Committee with grateful thanks to Dr. Conley and the members of his committee.

The president of the College and University Department commented on the keynote speech in the Elementary School Department at the 1963 convention. He stated that wide publicity had been given to this speech, which had criticized the Catholic colleges, and that his purpose in making his objection to the speech was to suggest that it was not in harmony with the resolution passed at the Planning Committee and Board meetings in June, 1962, which declared: "*Be it resolved*, that on the 60th Anniversary of the NCEA, the NCEA Executive Board declares as a matter of policy that the convention program in St. Louis stress the outstanding achievements of the Catholic schools and their potential for even greater achievements in the future."

The Board next considered point by point the recommendations of the Planning Committee for the 1964 convention. They approved the recom-

mendation that the NCEA exhibit be changed to a kiosk-type exhibit, the details to be worked out by the national office. They encouraged the national office to try to incorporate in the new design the ideas suggested by Monsignor McManus that the exhibit publicize the organizational setup of the NCEA and also advertise the Catholic Education Exhibit at the New York World's Fair.

The Board accepted the recommendation that Dr. Conley be asked to continue as chairman of the Evaluation Committee for the 1964 convention. It is hoped that an assistant chairman can be identified to assist Dr. Conley.

The Board approved the recommendation that the national office be free to determine type, size, and format of the program of the 1964 convention.

The Board amended the theme suggested by the Planning Committee to "Catholic Education and National Needs." It requested that the national office prepare a one-page explanation of the theme for the heads of departments to use at their executive committee meetings.

The Board voted to invite the Most Reverend John J. Dougherty, Auxiliary Bishop of Newark and President of Seton Hall University, to be the keynote speaker.

The Board approved the schedule for the opening day: 9 A.M., Pontifical Dialogue Low Mass in Convention Hall with Archbishop Damiano of Camden as celebrant and preacher; 10:15 A.M., Formal Opening of Exhibits with Archbishop Cody presiding; 11 A.M., Opening General Meeting; 2 P.M., opening departmental meetings.

The Board approved the recommendation that there be a second general session at 9 A.M. on Wednesday in Convention Hall and voted to ask Senator Ribicoff to speak at this session.

The Board voted to hold one general closing session on Friday at 9 A.M. with an outstanding name speaker, with the understanding that the executive committees of the departments may arrange such kind of business sessions as they may desire after the closing general session. The Board suggested the names of possible speakers.

Instead of setting up a convention session especially to interest diocesan school board members as suggested by the Planning Committee, the Board voted to request the superintendents to invite the members of the diocesan school boards to come to the convention and to attend all the sessions in which they may be interested this year (except, of course, closed sessions) and to try to determine just how many members of the diocesan school boards do attend in order to judge whether or not it would be wise to schedule a meeting specifically for them in a future year.

The Board voted against the request of the Catholic Business Educators Association to have commercial exhibits at their 20th anniversary convention in 1965, to be held in conjunction with the NCEA convention, as requested by Sister Edith Marie, and instructed the Executive Secretary to inform Sister Edith Marie.

Mr. O'Donnell reported that negotiations are still under way with the officials of the Americana and the New Hilton Hotels in New York City for the 1965 convention. The staff of the national office hopes to visit the sites in the near future and confer with officials. Mr. O'Donnell stated that McCormick Place in Chicago, the site of the 1966 convention, is an excellent facility for our convention. Boston's new Prudential Center, which has been considered for the 1967 convention, may be too small for NCEA needs. It might be possible to spread the meeting out to various meeting halls besides

the Prudential Center, but this would require continuous shuttle bus service and a detailed map of the facilities being used. It was reported, also, that New Orleans may have the facilities for an NCEA meeting in the not too distant future. Mr. O'Donnell visited the facilities in San Francisco and reported that it would be possible to put on a good convention using the various facilities in the area of Brooks Hall. However, the great distance and expense involved in bringing the convention across country were pointed out as reasons against holding the convention in San Francisco. Mr. O'Donnell stated that he would try to prepare a more detailed report on various convention sites for the next meeting of the Board.

Dr. Conley presented the report of the subcommittee of the Board on the proposed objectives of the NCEA convention. The report is based on expectations of delegates as reported in the convention evaluations over the past five years and on suggestions of the Board and members of the committee. The proposed statement of objectives follows:

1. To present information about and analysis of the current problems of Catholic education in its entirety.
2. To report significant research and experimentation unique to Catholic education at each instructional level.
3. To provide a forum of discussion by departments of practical problems peculiar to Catholic education.
4. To discuss adaptation and incorporation of educational developments in Catholic schools.
5. To present regularly to the American public a positive report on Catholic education in action.

The Board directed that this proposed statement be submitted to the executive committees of the Departments with the request that they consider the statement and submit suggestions for modifications or additions to the national office prior to November 1, 1963.

Note:—The convention should be looked upon as a supplement to other educational meetings. It cannot—it should not—attempt to cover all educational problems which are discussed at state, regional and national meetings of other organizations.

A report on the progress of the Catholic Education Exhibit at the New York World's Fair was presented. Letters requesting donations for this project have gone to those school superintendents whose ordinaries have approved the collection, to colleges and universities, and to religious superiors. A fact sheet on the Exhibit, stating progress to date and indicating what remains to be done, was given to each Board member. A subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on the Exhibit will meet with a designer in July 1963 to plan the basic theme of the Exhibit.

No decision was made on the matter of purchasing tickets for the World's Fair at discount rates in advance of the opening of the Fair. The Executive Secretary will continue to investigate this matter.

The Board referred to the Minor Seminary Department the questions raised by Father William Martin, chairman of the Vocation Section, concerning the publication of a newsletter for the Vocation Section and publication by the section of the speeches given at their sessions at the convention. The

president of the Minor Seminary Department will confer with Father Martin and report on this matter at the next Board meeting.

A request from the School Superintendents Department to publish a report of the Committee on Moral and Spiritual Values in Public Education prepared by Father Neil McCluskey, S.J., was discussed by the Board. It was reported that the original intent of the committee was that the report would be made available only to the hierarchy and the members of the department. The committee, however, now recommends publication of the report. On motion of the president of the School Superintendents Department, the Board voted to consider approval of publishing the report after it has had an opportunity to see and study it. Monsignor McManus, chairman of the committee, agreed to send copies of the report to all members of the Board, and action on publication will be taken at the next meeting of the Board.

The Committee on Moral and Spiritual Values of the School Superintendents Department also requested a grant of \$2,500 to initiate the preparation of a manuscript for a guidebook on Catholicism for public school teachers. The committee felt that such a guidebook was necessary since many Catholic children are in public schools. The Board voted that this project be considered for inclusion in the budget for 1964.

The chairman of the Committee on Lay Teachers of the School Superintendents Department reported that the committee had prepared a questionnaire which it wishes to have designed for data processing and sent out to all lay teachers in the Catholic schools. The information obtained would be for the use of the School Superintendents Department of the NCEA. The Board agreed that this matter should be carried over to its next meeting.

A report of a subcommittee of the Board appointed to investigate the possibility of a lay teacher section in the NCEA was presented by Dr. Conley. He stated that the consensus was that lay teachers should not be segregated into a separate section in NCEA but should be integrated into the sections already established. The subcommittee felt that if the Board wishes to encourage lay teachers to join the NCEA, then special services will have to be offered to them. A committee would have to investigate such matters as group insurance for members of NCEA, pension plans or information on the availability of TIAA to private schools, possible publications dealing with orientation of lay teachers to Catholic schools, the possibility of regional meetings to bring together lay and religious teachers. The Board asked Dr. Conley to submit the report with any recommended modifications to the Board before the February meeting so that they may study it further.

The Executive Secretary reported that the Catholic College Admissions and Information Center has requested assistance from the NCEA in order to keep the Center functioning and to expand its services. The Board voted to refer this matter to the executive committee of the College and University Department for thorough discussion and recommendations. The president of the Department requested that an extremely detailed report on the Center be presented to the executive committee at its October 2 meeting in Washington and that a representative of the Center be present at the meeting.

Recent correspondence in the national office indicated that the American Association of Theological Schools had received inquiries from Catholic seminaries about the possibility of their joining that Association. It was reported that this matter had been discussed at both the Chicago and New York

regional meetings of the NCEA Seminary Departments and that the consensus at those meetings was that the seminaries should seek accreditation from the regional accrediting agencies.

Monsignor Schneider reported that it was the desire of the Seminary Departments to hold a regional meeting on the master's programs in seminaries and requested approval of the Board for such a meeting to be held in the North Central region. The Board approved this request and suggested that the matter of Catholic seminaries joining AATS be included on the agenda for this regional meeting.

The Board approved NCEA cooperation with the National Council of Churches on a proposed project to prepare and disseminate information on religious vocations for the public schools. It is hoped that a committee of representatives of the NCEA, National Council of Churches, and an appropriate Jewish agency can meet in the fall to investigate the matter.

A letter to school superintendents from the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine concerning the establishment of a new National Catechetical Commission was brought to the attention of the Board. The president of the Department of School Superintendents was asked to discuss this letter thoroughly with the Department and to report to the Board at its next meeting.

The Executive Secretary asked the opinions of the members of the Board on a proposal to raise the dues for the Elementary and Secondary School institutional members to amounts something like \$25.00 per year for elementary and \$50.00 to \$100.00 per year for secondary schools. It was stated that with the increase of dues, approval could probably be given promptly to projects such as those proposed recently by various departments, but apprehension was expressed over how many schools could actually afford higher rates. A few members felt that higher rates would result in a loss of members. Others stated that a raise in dues would require additional services from the national office. Many members emphasized the need to put out a brochure stating the things NCEA is not able to do because of a lack of funds—projects, research, etc.; some felt that a brochure was needed which showed the many services NCEA already performs. One suggestion for a raise in dues was to predicate the rates on the number of teachers in the schools. It was the opinion of many Board members that the matter should be discussed thoroughly by the executive committees of the Departments concerned at their meetings in October and the Board instructed the representatives of these Departments to present this item for discussion at their October meetings.

The Board voted to hold the next meeting on February 18, 1964, in Washington, D.C.

The Board authorized another meeting of lay people at the 1964 meeting of NCEA, under the sponsorship of the Department of School Superintendents, and agreed to the suggestion that an appeal be made to the national officers of the NCCM and NCCW to urge their local groups to pay expenses of delegates to the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 6 P.M.

FREDERICK G. HOCHWALT
Executive Secretary

Madison Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 18, 1964

THE MEETING of the Executive Board of Directors was opened with prayer at 10:10 A.M. by His Excellency, the Most Reverend John P. Cody, President General. Other members of the Board present were: Brother E. Anthony, F.S.C., Philadelphia, Pa.; Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate, Columbus, Ohio; Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X., Newton Highlands, Mass.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul E. Campbell, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Dr. William H. Conley, Bridgeport, Conn.; Rev. Thomas W. Coyle, C.S.S.R., Oconomowoc, Wis.; Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, St. Louis, Mo.; Very Rev. Armand H. Desautels, A.A., Worcester, Mass.; Very Rev. Vincent C. Dore, O.P., Providence, R.I.; Sister Mary Edward, P.B.V.M., Dubuque, Iowa; Very Rev. Msgr. Edmond A. Fournier, Bloomfield, Mich.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edmund J. Goebel, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Paul Haverty, New York, N.Y.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. James E. Hoflich, St. Louis, Mo.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Sylvester J. Holbel, Orchard Park, N.Y.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, Louisville, Ky.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. Leo Keaveny, Little Falls, Minn.; Rev. Daniel Kirwin, Wheeling, W.Va.; Very Rev. James A. Laubacher, S.S., Baltimore, Md.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. William E. McManus, Chicago, Ill.; Very Rev. Msgr. John E. Murphy, Little Rock, Ark.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix Newton Pitt, Louisville, Ky.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis E. Riedel, Milwaukee, Wis.; Very Rev. Herman Romoser, O.S.B., St. Meinrad, Ind.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Carl J. Ryan, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frank M. Schneider, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Edwin Stuardi, Mobile, Ala.; and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, Washington, D.C. Mr. J. Walter Kennedy, New York, N.Y., was also present.

The Executive Secretary reported that the absent member, Very Rev. Donald Ryan, C.M., was hospitalized for surgery.

The minutes of the last meeting were accepted as submitted.

The financial report for 1963 and proposed budget for 1964 totaling \$264,460 were presented by the Executive Secretary. The audit of Association funds will be presented at the June meeting. The Board approved the financial report for 1963 and the proposed budget for 1964.

The Executive Secretary reported that Monsignor D'Amour, Associate Secretary of the School Superintendents Department, will return to his diocese of Marquette at the conclusion of the convention. Monsignor Applegate, president of the Department, and a committee are considering a number of candidates for the office of Associate Secretary of the School Superintendents Department. The Executive Secretary announced that Brother E. Anthony, F.S.C., will work with Father Koob, Associate Secretary of the Secondary School Department, as Evaluation and Accreditation Consultant for the Secondary School Department for a term of three years. Eventually the same type of consultant is planned for the Elementary School Department. The Executive Secretary announced that for some time investigations have been under way to identify a lay person with academic and collegiate background to act as an assistant to the Executive Secretary. A well-qualified candidate is now under consideration, and the Executive Secretary stated that since the Board had always empowered him to add to the staff, he would pursue the matter further unless there was dissent because of the person. Other additions to the staff announced by the Executive Secretary were Miss Mary Anne Sigler, Secretary of the International Student Program, and Miss Carol Enzler, secretary to the Executive Secretary. The Board approved the report on staff in the national office.

In the reports from the presidents of the Secondary and Elementary School Departments, Brother Anthony stated that it was the opinion of his committee that, in view of the research projects undertaken by the Secondary Department and of the \$11,000 additional budget for 1964 over 1963, there be an increase of dues for the Secondary Department to \$25.00 per year. There was mention of across-the-board raises in dues for all departments from a minimum of \$50.00 up. Monsignor McManus reported that it was the opinion of the Elementary Department executive committee that, if a budget calling for vastly increased expenditures for an expanded program were presented to the board of the Elementary School Department, the dues would be raised accordingly \$5.00 to \$10.00.

The Board voted that before the Atlantic City meeting the Associate Secretaries of the Elementary, Secondary, and Superintendents Departments meet with the presidents of these three departments under the chairmanship of Monsignor Hochwalt to review proposals for increased expenditures that would necessitate an increase in the dues. The matter will then be decided at the convention meeting, and it was understood that even if the Elementary Department could not decide on a dues raise, the Secondary Department will go ahead with a raise in its dues. The Executive Secretary will inform the school superintendents of the contemplated raise of dues by a letter.

The Executive Board approved the "Preliminary Draft on Affiliation of Other Organizations with NCEA" submitted by the Executive Secretary, and requested that he proceed to draw up Articles of Affiliation based upon it and submit them for the approval of the Board.

The new design for the NCEA convention exhibit was approved by the Board. The Executive Secretary reported that the preliminary program would be ready for distribution the following week, and announced the names of the speakers for the general sessions at the convention. The use of the Treasure Chest idea in the Exhibit Hall was approved for this year. Copies of the convention *Newsletter* containing information on Mass arrangements, etc., were presented to the Board.

The Board unanimously requested Archbishop Cody to consent to have his name placed in nomination to serve another year as President General of NCEA. Archbishop Cody accepted the invitation.

Future sites for the annual NCEA convention are: 1965, New York City; 1966, Chicago; 1967, Boston, Atlantic City, or Philadelphia; 1968, San Francisco; 1969, Detroit's Cobo Hall. Both New Orleans and Cincinnati will be investigated as possible sites for future conventions.

Monsignor McManus proposed that there be a year's moratorium on the NCEA convention. He suggested, instead, that NCEA try to raise a half-million dollars for the Association by requesting publishers, schools, religious communities, exhibitors, etc., to contribute to the NCEA instead of incurring the expense of sending representatives to the convention, advertising, etc. No action was taken on this suggestion.

The Board voted to hold the summer meetings of the 1965 Convention Planning Committee and Executive Board on June 9 and 11, 1964, at a suitable meeting place to be arranged by the Executive Secretary.

A report on the status of the Catholic Education Exhibit in the Hall of Education at the New York World's Fair was given by Monsignor Applegate. The Board approved the model of the Catholic Education Exhibit.

Every level of Catholic education will be depicted to show the concrete reality of the contribution of the Catholic schools to American education.

Plans for the opening of the exhibit were discussed. The official opening will be April 22 and it was suggested that it might be possible to have Cardinal Marella open the Catholic Education Exhibit when he is in New York for the opening of the Vatican Exhibit at the Fair. Archbishop Cody will investigate this possibility.

The Board approved the slate of three new members of the Problems and Plans Committee to serve for the period 1964-66: Rev. Robert C. Newbold, Warwick, Rhode Island; Sister Francis Eileen, S.L., Denver, Colorado; and Mr. J. Alan Davitt, Buffalo, New York.

The Board approved the proposed project of the Problems and Plans Committee to research the question of the increase or decrease and advantages and disadvantages of coinstitutional high schools, and allocated funds not exceeding \$3,000 for the study.

The minutes of the October, 1963, meeting of the Problems and Plans Committee were approved by the Board.

A report of the regional meeting of the North Central Seminaries held in Chicago on November 12 and 13 concerned with the master's program in Theology was given by Monsignor Schneider. One of the recommendations from the meeting which will be brought to the Board after discussion by the departments concerned the possibility of having one Seminary Department with three sections to give some recognition to the middle four years (college level) of seminary training. The Board appointed Monsignor Schneider, Monsignor Hochwalt, Father Coyle, and representatives of the College Department to set up a group that could offer the services of the NCEA to the committee of the hierarchy which is concerned with the problem of accreditation of seminaries. Monsignor Hochwalt stated that he has replaced Bishop Rhea, with the permission of Cardinal Spellman, on a committee with representatives of Protestant and Jewish seminaries to consider a joint financial drive whereby seminary training would be upgraded in this country.

A report on the Lay Teacher Section was given by Dr. Conley. It was the opinion of his committee that the lay teachers should not be segregated into a separate section of NCEA but should be integrated into the appropriate departments. It was proposed that NCEA ought to offer some opportunities for professional organization of both lay and religious teachers at local levels where they would feel an actual affiliation and might fill a void that seems to exist, and which possibly would be assumed by an outside organization. The matter was deferred to the executive committee of the School Superintendents Department next meeting and Dr. Conley was asked to appear before this committee. The results of that departmental meeting will be referred back to the Executive Board at its meeting in June.

The resolution of the College and University Department regarding the directive from the Holy See in connection with the granting of degrees was read to the members of the Executive Board. It was stated that since this was a directive of the Holy See to local Ordinaries, NCEA probably is not the proper organization to act. The President General stated that he would investigate this matter further when he is next in Rome.

The Vocation Section report was deferred until the next meeting.

The Board authorized that the document "Guidelines to the Catholic Church in the Public School," prepared by Father McCluskey for a Superintendents committee, be re-edited and updated in certain parts and then

published for general consumption. The determination of the number of copies to be printed was left with the Executive Secretary. Monsignor McManus will present the final copy to the Executive Secretary.

The report from the Superintendents Department on the discussion of the CCD proposal for a National Catechetical Commission was given by Monsignor Applegate. The Board approved the tabling of the CCD proposal for future consideration.

A brief report on the Carnegie Study of Catholic Schools was given by the Executive Secretary. The first volume of the study will be ready by August 15.

The announcement of two graduate summer school workshops for Catholic elementary school administrators, scheduled for the University of Dayton this summer, was made.

The next meeting of the Board will take place March 31, beginning at 6:30 P.M., in the Claridge Hotel, Atlantic City.

Monsignor Schneider thanked everyone for their presence and discussion. The meeting adjourned at 4:20 P.M.

FREDERICK G. HOCHWALT
Executive Secretary

Claridge Hotel, Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 31, 1964

THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF DIRECTORS convened for a dinner meeting in the Claridge Hotel at 6:30 P.M. on Tuesday, March 31, 1964. His Excellency, the Most Reverend John P. Cody, President General, presided at the business meeting which he opened at 8:50 P.M. A prayer was offered for the recently deceased mother of Monsignor Hochwalt, Executive Secretary.

Other members of the Board present were: Brother E. Anthony, F.S.C., Philadelphia, Pa.; Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate, Columbus, Ohio; Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X., Newton Highlands, Mass.; Dr. William H. Conley, Bridgeport, Conn.; Rev. Thomas W. Coyle, C.S.S.R., Oconomowoc, Wis.; Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, St. Louis, Mo.; Very Rev. Vincent C. Dore, O.P., Providence, R.I.; Sister Mary Edward, P.B.V.M., Dubuque, Iowa; Very Rev. Msgr. Edmond A. Fournier, Bloomfield Hills, Mich.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edmund J. Goebel, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Paul Haverly, New York, N.Y.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. James E. Hoflich, St. Louis, Mo.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Sylvester J. Holbel, Orchard Park, N.Y.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, Louisville, Ky.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Daniel Kirwin, Vienna, W.Va.; Very Rev. James A. Laubacher, S.S., Baltimore, Md.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. William E. McManus, Chicago, Ill.; Very Rev. Msgr. John E. Murphy, Little Rock, Ark.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix Newton Pitt, Louisville, Ky.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis E. Riedel, Milwaukee, Wis.; Very Rev. Herman Romoser, O.S.B., St. Meinrad, Ind.; Very Rev. Donald J. Ryan, C.M., St. Louis, Mo.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frank M. Schneider, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Edwin Stuardi, Mobile, Ala.; and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, Washington, D.C. Mr. J. Walter Kennedy, New York, N.Y., was also present.

The Executive Secretary read messages from the absent members: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul E. Campbell, Very Rev. Armand H. Desautels, A.A., Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. Leo Keaveny, and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Carl J. Ryan.

The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last meeting and approved the minutes as submitted.

The Board voted unanimously to reelect the Executive Secretary for a term of three years and he was accorded a vote of appreciation for his services.

The Executive Secretary thanked the Board for honoring him once again with reelection. He then requested that the Board appoint a committee to find a man who could replace him as secretary within the next three years so that he could resign not later than three years from this date. He expressed his deep appreciation for the many kindnesses and courtesies extended to him over the twenty-one years of his term as Executive Secretary and asked that the Board now honor his request to resign within three years. The President General stated that the Board would take the matter under consideration.

Dr. Conley reported that the 1964 convention had an excellent beginning from all reports and that the registration on the first day totaled 9,148.* The evaluation committee had its first meeting and a sampling of the comments of delegates will be mailed immediately after the convention. The report of the evaluation committee will be presented at the June meeting. Dr. Conley's report was approved by the Board.

The Executive Secretary reported that after discussion with the staff and others it was recommended that the invitation to hold the June Planning and Board meeting in Stamford, Connecticut, on June 9 and 11 be accepted. The Board accepted the invitation.

The president of the Secondary School Department, Brother Anthony, reported that the executive committee of the department had voted in favor of a sliding-scale rate of dues for the department, as follows: \$25.00 for schools with enrollment up to 400 pupils; \$50.00 for enrollment 400 to 1,000; \$100.00 for enrollment over 1,000 pupils.

The president of the School Superintendents Department, Monsignor Applegate, reported that the superintendents' executive committee, after considering the rationale for a raise in secondary dues as presented to them by the Associate Secretary for the Secondary School Department, agreed that they would present this sliding-scale rate as a recommendation of the executive committee to the general meeting of superintendents during the convention. Brother Anthony stated further that the Secondary School Department planned to circulate to superintendents a brochure listing the services to schools, such as the materials of the curriculum advisory committees, et cetera. The president of the Elementary School Department, Monsignor McManus, moved that the scale of dues proposed by the Secondary School Department be approved. The motion was seconded by Monsignor Applegate and then approved by a vote of the Board.

Monsignor Applegate reported that a proposal had been made that a joint committee of superintendents and representatives of the Elementary School Department be formed to look into the matter of a raise of dues at the elementary level.

The president of the Elementary School Department, Monsignor McManus, reported that at the general meeting of the Elementary School Department and at the executive committee meeting a recommendation had been made that the institutional members of the Elementary School Department be asked to contribute \$5.00 per school to raise a fund to be used to prepare a book documenting the validity of the parochial school idea and the success story

* Subsequent days brought the total registration up to 17,688—the largest number ever registered at an NCEA convention.

of the American Catholic parochial school. He stated that there were no negative votes at the general elementary meeting and at the departmental executive committee meeting. The president of the Secondary School Department, Brother Anthony, moved that the proposal be approved by the Board. The question was asked if this would be an NCEA proposal and Monsignor McManus said that the idea was that the NCEA, as it does for the Gabriel Richard Lecture, would commission a top-flight author to write the volume. Sister Mary Edward reiterated the report of Monsignor McManus that the elementary people were highly enthusiastic about the project. Monsignor Haverty seconded the motion of Brother Anthony. Monsignor Applegate stated that this had not been discussed by the superintendents and he could not state their position on this proposal. Monsignor Haverty said that he felt that the superintendents would recognize the present need for such a volume and that on having an explanation from Monsignor Applegate, president of the Superintendents Department, would approve such a project. Monsignor McManus stated further that this would be a definitive study of the validity of the parochial school system, stating its philosophy, commitments, et cetera, and would use such things as the Carnegie Study of Catholic Schools, the research being done at the University of Chicago, and so forth. It would not be a propagandistic volume. The President General stated that the motion had been made and seconded by Brother Anthony and Monsignor Haverty to send a letter to all institutional members of the Elementary School Department asking them to contribute \$5.00 each to raise a fund to prepare a book on the validity of the parochial school idea and the success story of the American Catholic parochial school, with the understanding that the president of the School Superintendents Department would inform the superintendents in advance. The vote of the Board was taken and the motion passed with four dissenting votes.

Discussion of the Prentice-Hall proposal for a series of college texts, and the proposed expansion of the Lay Teacher Committee were deferred to the next meeting of the Board.

It was reported that while great strides have been made by some seminaries, especially in the area of regional accreditation, there are some seminaries, eager to obtain theological accreditation, who have proposed joining the American Association of Theological Schools. The Board felt that while it was not in their competency to tell the seminaries not to do this, they nevertheless felt that in view of the complications that could arise, it would be better not to do so.

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 P.M.

FREDERICK G. HOCHWALT
Executive Secretary

Report of the Executive Secretary

THE ANNUAL MEETING of the National Catholic Educational Association at Atlantic City, March 29 to April 3, 1964, brought into sharp focus the fact that the Association has become a tremendous force in American education. The largest group of exhibitors and delegates (total registration: 17,688) attested to the fact that interest in Catholic education is at an all-time high. Sensitive and controversial issues about the future of the NCEA were put before the delegates and their response was a challenge both for the present and for the future.

As in all recent conventions, the Association found itself host to representatives of the United States Government and to interested observers and spectators from Western Europe, from Canada, and from Latin America.

Once again our membership has grown, and with it the national staff. The loyalty of the staff, the general membership, and a more widely interested public have ensured broader bases of operation and wider horizons of interest. As in the past, our aims are to extend our professional scope and to cooperate as effectively as possible with all educational groups who have problems in common with us. Thanks to all who have cooperated, our future does, indeed, seem more challenging than ever.

Membership

The membership of the Association increased from 13,603 to 14,032 between March 31, 1963, and March 31, 1964—a gain of 429 members. By departments and sections, the membership is as follows:

Sustaining members	56
Institutional members	
Major Seminary Department	137
Minor Seminary Department	176
College and University Department	291
Newman Foundation Section	14
Secondary School Department	2,370
Elementary School Department	8,563
Special Education Department	314
School Superintendents Department	289
Individual members	
General	1,264
Newman Section	15
Supervisors Section	417
Vocation Section	126
Total members	14,032

(In addition, there are 242 subscribers to our publications.)

All those engaged in Catholic education can take credit for the growing strength of the Association. Special gratitude is due those dioceses and religious communities which have achieved 100 percent membership of their schools in the Association. *For elementary schools* there were twenty-four 100-percent

dioceses in 1963: Atlanta, Boston, Buffalo, Burlington, Cheyenne, Byzantine Rite of Chicago, Columbus, Dubuque, Hartford, Juneau, La Crosse, Lansing, Milwaukee, Ogdensburg (N.Y.), Peoria, Byzantine Rite of Philadelphia, Raleigh, Rockford, Sioux City, Syracuse, Trenton, Wilmington, Yakima, Youngstown.

For secondary schools, 102 dioceses—2 out of every 3 in the United States—have achieved 100-percent membership. They are: Allentown, Altoona-Johnstown, Amarillo, Atlanta, Austin, Baker, Baltimore, Baton Rouge, Belleville, Boise, Boston, Bridgeport, Brooklyn, Buffalo, Burlington, Camden, Cheyenne, Chicago, Byzantine Rite of Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Covington, Crookston, Davenport, Detroit, Dodge City, Dubuque, Duluth, Evansville, Fairbanks, Fall River, Fort Wayne-South Bend, Gallup, Grand Island, Green Bay, Greensburg, Hartford, Honolulu, Indianapolis, Joliet, Juneau, Kansas City (Kan.), La Crosse, Lafayette (Ind.), Lansing, Madison, Manchester, Marquette, Milwaukee, Mobile-Birmingham, Monterey-Fresno, Nashville, Natchez-Jackson, Newark, New Ulm, New York, Norwich, Oakland, Ogdensburg, Oklahoma City-Tulsa, Paterson, Peoria, Philadelphia, Byzantine Rite of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Byzantine Rite of Pittsburgh, Pueblo, Raleigh, Rapid City, Reno, Rochester, Rockford, Rockville Centre, Sacramento, St. Augustine, St. Cloud, St. Louis, St. Paul, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, Santa Rosa, Savannah, Seattle, Sioux City, Springfield (Ill.), Springfield (Mass.), Springfield-Cape Girardeau (Mo.), Stockton, Byzantine Rite of Stamford, Steubenville, Superior, Syracuse, Toledo, Trenton, Tuscon, Washington, Wheeling, Wilmington, Worcester, Yakima, Youngstown.

Finances

Appendix II presents the financial report for the fiscal year 1963. The report sets forth the various categories carried on our books and shows a total of \$318,905.23 of current funds administered during 1963.

The Executive Board has asked me to extend warm thanks to the members of the Association for their generosity and loyalty, to the bishops of the United States, to Catholic publishers and corporations, and to the many friends of the Association who during 1963 donated to the Association an amount totaling \$14,570.00. This continuing help is a source of inspiration to the staff and an effective stimulus to expanded services.

Staff

Five associate secretaries, two assistant secretaries, and an office staff of twenty persons are now required to administer the national office. Following are the current major posts in the Washington office:

Executive Secretary—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt

Associate Secretary, Major and Minor Seminary Departments—Position to be filled

Associate Secretary, College and University Department—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.

Associate Secretary, School Superintendents Department—Position to be filled

Associate Secretary, Secondary School Department—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O. Praem.

Associate Secretary, Elementary School Department—Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.

Assistant Secretary, Elementary School Department—Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D.

Associate Secretary, Special Education Department—Very Rev. Msgr. Elmer H. Behrmann

Executive Secretary, Sister Formation Section—Sister Annette, C.S.J.

Assistant Executive Secretary, Sister Formation Section—Sister Ritamary, C.H.M.

Secretary for International Student Program—Miss Mary Anne Sigler

Administrative Assistant for Management and Personnel—Miss Nancy Brewer

Administrative Assistant for Coordination of Program and Research—Mrs. Winifred R. Long

Convention and Exhibit Manager—Mr. Joseph O'Donnell

Committees of the Association

In addition to the Executive Board, the chief committee activities of the Association revolve around the Problems and Plans Committee, the Convention Planning Committee, the Richard Lecture Selection Committee, the Washington Committee, and the National Catholic Adult Education Commission. The work of committees identified with the various departments can be found in the *Proceedings* for the respective departments.

Relationships with Other Agencies and Associations

From June 1963 to June 1964, the Association took part in the following conferences and meetings. Unless otherwise identified, the representatives indicated were members of the NCEA staff.

June 5-6: National Association of Exhibit Managers, Summer Meeting, Kansas City, Mo.—Mr. Joseph O'Donnell.

June 6: U.S. Office of Education, Visualized Report on A National Study of Local Production Programs in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O. Praem.

June 12: Association for Higher Education, Meeting of Washington Consultants on Programs for Nineteenth National Conference on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.

June 16-22: Workshop for Supervisors, Loretto Heights College, Loretto, Colo.—Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.

June 19: Georgetown University Panel on the Gifted, Washington, D.C.—Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.

June 19-21: American Council on Education, Conference on Federal Programs for Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.—Rev. T. Byron Collins, S.J., Vice President for Business and Finance, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

June 23-25: National Conference of Keep America Beautiful, Washington, D.C.—Mr. Francis T. Casey, Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.

June 24: Center for Applied Research in Education, Advisory Board, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.

June 25-28: Eighteenth National Conference of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Columbus, Ohio—Bro. Adelbert James, F.S.C., Head, Education Department, Manhattan College, New York, N.Y.; Rev. Roman A. Bernert, S.J., Chairman, Department of Education, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.; Dr. William Fenelon, DePaul Univer-

sity, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Carl A. Hangartner, S.J., Coordinator of Teacher Education, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. Bernard J. Kohlbrenner, Professor of Education, University of Notre Dame, Ind.; Rev. Philip C. Niehaus, C.S.Sp., Assistant Dean, School of Education, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Rev. Joseph P. Owens, S.J., Associate Professor of Education, John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio; Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D., Department of Education, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

- July 3: Meeting of Representatives of Higher Education Associations, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- July 17: Meeting of Representatives of Higher Education Associations, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- July 23: National Education Association, Meeting on Revisions in Copyright Law, Washington, D.C.—Mr. Vincent C. Allred, Legal Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.
- July 25: American Council on Education, Meeting on Higher Education Legislation, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- Aug. 19: U.S. Office of Education, Committee for the Exchange of Teachers, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- Sept. 12: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Board of Judges, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- Sept. 15-18: Eighteenth National Conference on Citizenship, Washington, D.C.—Mrs. Marguerite Campbell and Mrs. Mary Millspaugh.
- Sept. 17: Meeting of Representatives of Higher Education Associations, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- Sept. 22-25: National Conference on Problems of Rural Youth in a Changing Environment, Stillwater, Okla.—Mother Mary Euphrasia, O.S.F., St. Francis Convent, Tiffin, Ohio.
- Sept. 23-25: Fourteenth Annual Meeting of Mission-Sending Societies, Washington, D.C.—Sister Annette, C.S.J.; Sister Ritamary, C.H.M.; and Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.
- Sept. 24: College Placement Council, Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.
- Sept. 25: American Jewish Committee, Intergroup Relations and Catholic Schools, New York, N.Y.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour.
- Sept. 25: Diocesan School Board Meeting, Richmond, Va.—Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.
- Sept. 26-28: Catholic Association for International Peace, Washington, D.C.—Mrs. Betty Randall.
- Oct. 3-4: American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt; Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.; and Mrs. Winifred R. Long.
- Oct. 4: Association of American Colleges, Commission on Christian Higher Education, Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.
- Oct. 8: Higher Education Group of Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.
- Oct. 10-11: Ohio Catholic Education Association, Columbus, Ohio—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- Oct. 13-15: National Conference of Christians and Jews, Institute on Religion and Education, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour.
- Oct. 14: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.
- Oct. 25-26: Second National Congress on Medical Quackery, Washington, D.C.—Mr. Vincent Allred, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.
- Oct. 28-29: Round Table of National Organizations, Harriman, N.Y.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour.

- Oct. 28-31: National Safety Congress and Exposition, Chicago, Ill.—Sister Mary Amadeo, S.S.N.D., Principal, St. Benedict's School, Blue Island, Ill.
- Oct. 31: Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., Luncheon Conference, Washington, D.C.—Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M., and Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D.
- Oct. 31-Nov. 1: Twenty-eighth Educational Conference sponsored by Educational Records Bureau, New York, N.Y.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem., and Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.
- Nov. 2: Educational Testing Service, Invitational Conference on Testing Problems, New York, N.Y.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour; Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.; Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.; and Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.
- Nov. 5: National Housing Center, Meeting on Schools and Urban Growth, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour.
- Nov. 6-7: Annual Audio-Visual and Pictorial Equipment Show, Washington, D.C.—Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D., and Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.
- Nov. 13-15: Fourth National Conference on Driver Education, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem., and Mr. William Pflaum.
- Nov. 18: National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, Washington, D.C.—Sister Annette, C.S.J.; Sister Ritamary, C.H.M.
- Nov. 14-15: American Council on Education, Commission on International Affairs, Washington, D.C.—Mrs. Winifred R. Long.
- Nov. 18: Religious Education Association, Board of Directors, New York, N.Y.—Sister Annette, C.S.J.
- Nov. 19: International Visitors Information Service, Washington, D.C.—Mrs. Betty Randall and Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- Nov. 21: U.S. Office of Education, Committee for the Exchange of Teachers, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- Nov. 23: National Association of Foreign Student Advisors, Regional Conference, Washington, D.C.—Mrs. Betty Randall and Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- Nov. 29-30: National Catholic Welfare Conference, Foreign Visitors Office, Washington, D.C.—Mrs. Betty Randall and Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- Dec. 4-6: Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, Advisory Board, Key Biscayne, Fla.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- Dec. 5-6: National Association of Exhibit Managers Annual Meeting, Miami Beach, Fla.—Mr. Joseph O'Donnell.
- Dec. 9: American Council on Education, Commission on Federal Relations, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- Dec. 10: Higher Education Group of Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.
- Dec. 13-14: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Regional Conference, Washington, D.C.—Sister Annette, C.S.J.; Sister Ritamary, C.H.M.; Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.; Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.; Sister Carl Ann, C.S.C., Dunbarton College, Washington, D.C.; and Miss Joan Duval, Dunbarton College, Washington, D.C.
- Dec. 16: American Council on Education, Meeting on Higher Education Facilities Act, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- Dec. 27-28: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Regional Conference, Boston, Mass.—Brother Henry, O.S.F., St. Francis College, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Sister Mary Dorilda, S.S.A., Anna Maria College, Paxton, Mass.; Rev. Charles F. Donovan, S.J., Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
- Jan. 6-7: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Regional Conference, Miami, Fla.—Sister Trinita, O.P., Barry College, Miami.
- Jan. 9-10: College Entrance Examination Board and Institute of International Education, Workshop on Admission of Foreign Students to American Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.—Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- Jan. 10: U.S. Office of Education, Meeting on New Education Laws, New York.

- N.Y.—Brother Gregory, F.S.C., President, Manhattan College, New York, N.Y., and Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- Jan. 10-11: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Regional Conference, Chicago, Ill.—Dr. Urban H. Fleege, DePaul University, Chicago, Ill., and Sister Mary Margarita, Rosary College, River Forest, Ill.
- Jan. 13-14: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Regional Conference, Dallas, Tex.—Dr. John C. Broadhurst, University of Dallas, Dallas, Tex., and Rev. Hugh J. Haffey, C.S.B., University of St. Thomas, Houston, Tex.
- Jan. 13-16: Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.; Sister Annette, C.S.J.; Sister Ritamary, C.H.M.
- Jan. 14: Council for Financial Aid to Education, Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.
- Jan. 14: Citizens National Committee for Higher Education, Inc., Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.
- Jan. 15-18: Consejo Interamericano, Quito, Ecuador—Rev. Edward B. Rooney, S.J., President, Jesuit Educational Association, New York, N.Y.
- Jan. 16: Association of American Colleges, Commission on Christian Higher Education, Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.
- Jan. 17: Center for Applied Research in Education, Advisory Board, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- Jan. 17-18: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Regional Conference, Omaha, Neb.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. J. Gannon, Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa, and Rev. Carl A. Hangartner, S.J., Saint Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.
- Jan. 19-25: Eighth Congress on Interamerican Catholic Education, Quito, Ecuador—Rev. Edward B. Rooney, S.J.
- Jan. 20: National Education Association, Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour.
- Jan. 20-25: Catholic Interamerican Cooperation Program, Chicago, Ill.—Sister Annette, C.S.J., and Sister Ritamary, C.H.M.
- Jan. 23: Diocesan School Board Meeting, Richmond, Va.—Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.
- Jan. 23: "Poverty-in-Plenty" Seminar, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.—Mrs. Winifred R. Long and Mr. William Pflaum.
- Jan. 23-25: Catholic Conference on Interamerican Student Problems, Chicago, Ill.—Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- Jan. 24-25: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Regional Conference, Portland, Ore.—Sister Ann Myra, R.S.J.M., Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Ore.; and Dr. William W. Smith, University of Portland, Ore.
- Jan. 27-28: National Education Association and Joint Council on Educational Broadcasting, Conference on Allocations for ETV, Washington, D.C.—Rev. John M. Culkin, S.J.
- Jan. 27-28: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Regional Conference, San Diego, Calif.—Rev. John E. Baer, University of San Diego, College for Men, San Diego, Calif.; and Rev. Darrell F. X. Finnegan, S.J., Loyola University of Los Angeles, Calif.
- Feb. 3: Catholic Principals Association, State of Wisconsin, Appleton, Wis.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- Feb. 4: Higher Education Secretariate Group, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- Feb. 6: Association of American Colleges, Meeting on Teacher Education, Planning Session, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem, and Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.

- Feb. 9-12: National Association of Secondary School Principals, Chicago, Ill.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- Feb. 11: National Education Association, Meeting on Revisions in Copyright Law, Washington, D.C.—Mr. Vincent C. Allred, Legal Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.
- Feb. 12-15: Fifth Conference on International Education, Washington, D.C.—Sister Annette, C.S.J.; Sister Ritamary, C.H.M.; Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D.; and Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- Feb. 16-19: American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour; Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.; and Mr. Joseph O'Donnell.
- Feb. 24: Educational Testing Service, Cooperative Plan for Guidance and Admission, Pittsburgh, Pa.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour.
- Feb. 26-28: U.S. Office of Education, Conference of Supervisors of English in Grades K-12, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem., and Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.
- Feb. 28-29: National Merit Scholarship Corporation, Advisory Board, Evanston, Ill.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- March 3: American Council on Education, Commission on International Affairs, Washington, D.C.—Mrs. Winifred R. Long.
- March 5-7: National Association of Independent Schools, New York, N.Y.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- March 13: Foreign Policy Association, New York, N.Y.—Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- March 16: Association of American Colleges, Meeting on Teacher Education, Planning Session, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem., and Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.
- March 30: Educational Testing Service, Conference on Testing, Princeton, N.J.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour; Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.; Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.; Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.; and Mrs. Winifred R. Long.
- April 5: Council of National Organizations for Children and Youth, Washington, D.C.—Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.
- April 6-8: Joint Conference on Children and Youth, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.; Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.; Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D.; Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.; Sister Annette, C.S.J.; Sister Ritamary, C.H.M.; Miss Olga Frisby and Miss Margaret Mary Heyden, Dunbarton College, Washington, D.C.; Miss Patricia Byrne and Miss Emma Clare O'Keefe, Georgetown Visitation College, Washington, D.C.; Miss Elizabeth Hardy and Miss Carrol Malanoski, Immaculata Junior College, Washington, D.C.; Miss Francoise Lepage, Miss Marikay Thomes, and Miss Isabel McCall, Marymount College, Arlington, Va.; Miss Alice Meehan, Miss Virginia Hamill, and Miss Barbara Lucey, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.; and Miss Mary Anne Key, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
- April 8: American Automobile Association, National Board of Judges for 20th Annual Traffic Safety Poster Contest, Washington, D.C.—Sister M. Casimir, O.S.M., Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
- April 9-10: Round Table of National Organizations, Harriman, N.Y.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.
- April 9-15: Second International Conference on the Educational Uses of TV and Radio, Tokyo, Japan—Rev. John M. Culkin, S.J.
- April 10-12: Conference on Place of Small Private Liberal Arts Colleges Sponsored by Commissions on Christian Higher Education, Association of American Colleges, Racine, Wis.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.
- April 14: Higher Education Group of Washington, D.C.—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J., and Mrs. Winifred R. Long.

- April 17-18: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Washington, D.C.—Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.
- April 18: Seminar on Social Justice, 1964, Josephite Seminary, Washington, D.C.—Sister Annette, C.S.J., and Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.
- April 19-22: Evaluation, Diocese of Richmond, Va., High Schools—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.; Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.; and Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D.
- April 23: American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- April 28: Georgetown University Solemn Inter-Religious Convocation, "Moral Conscience of America," Washington, D.C.—Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D., and Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.
- April 28-May 1: Sixteenth Annual Conference on International Educational Exchange, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Minneapolis, Minn.—Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- April 30-May 2: National Education Association, Congress on Instruction, Washington, D.C.—Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem., and Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D.
- May 1-3: National Council of Teachers of English, Commission on English Curriculum, Chicago, Ill.—Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.
- May 7: United States Committee for the United Nations, Annual Meeting, New York, N.Y.—Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- May 13: Greater Washington, D.C., Council of International Visitors Information Service, Semiannual Meeting—Miss Mary Anne Sigler.
- May 18: American Council on Education, Commission on Federal Relations, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- May 19-20: U.S. State Department, National Foreign Policy Conference for Non-governmental Organizations, Washington, D.C.—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.
- May 22: Diocesan School Board Meeting, Richmond, Va.—Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.
- May 28-30: Commission on Higher Education, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Washington, D.C.: "Consultation on Student Aid for Young People of Limited Opportunities"—Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J.; Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.; Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M.; Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.; Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D.

Conclusion

The General Executive Board, along with department heads, presidents, officers of sections, members of the staff, have asked me to express in their name deepest thanks to the members and friends who have made another year of advance possible. Those of us who work with American educators are sensitive to their dedication and to their total commitment. Without this neither the NCEA nor any other national organization could continue.

FREDERICK G. HOCHWALT
Executive Secretary

Sermon. Pontifical Dialogue Low Mass

THE MOST REVEREND ARCHBISHOP
CELESTINE J. DAMIANO, D.D.
Bishop of Camden, New Jersey

EASTER WEEK is an appropriate time for Catholic educators to hold their convention. At this time, Holy Mother the Church presents for your meditation the fundamental truth of the resurrection of Christ from the dead. Every living member of the Mystical Body of Christ is a witness and a voice shouting out this tremendous truth. And as St. Thomas Aquinas writes in his beautiful *Adoro Te*, "Truth itself speaks truly or there is nothing true." And the great St. Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, in his first letter to the Corinthians, in the fifteenth chapter, goes to great length and gives a good account of his preaching and teaching: ". . . and the chief message I handed on to you, as it was handed on to me, that Christ, as the Scriptures had foretold, died for our sins; that He was buried, and then, as the Scriptures had foretold, rose again on the third day." As an excellent teacher he gave the facts to his audience and then confirmed them. "After the resurrection He was seen by Cephas (Peter), then by the eleven apostles, afterwards by more than five hundred of the brethren at once, most of whom are still alive to this day. . . . And lastly he was seen by me" [Paul].

There were many at the time of Paul who didn't believe in the resurrection of Christ, or, for that matter, in the resurrection of the dead of whom Christ was the "first-fruits." Paul argues from the common lot of all—sin and death. He makes a very telling comparison between Adam and Christ. Just as sin and death were ushered into this world by one man, Adam, likewise because of one person, Christ, we shall all rise again because, He being the *primogenitus*—the first-fruits—He had conquered Death. As the angel rolled back the stone from the tomb that enclosed Christ, likewise Christ by His resurrection has rolled back forever the stone that blocked the passage to heaven.

Paul was so taken up with this basic truth that he staked his entire teaching on the resurrection of Christ. In fact, he emphatically and explicitly stated that all is in vain unless Christ rose from the dead. The whole Scripture, both old and new, the lives of the Prophets and especially the greatest of them all, Jesus Christ Himself, all and everything became meaningful at the Resurrection. This one historical event gave purpose and meaning to the entire teaching of Christ because the two things were so identified that one confirmed the other. No doubt this is the only perfect example in history where the teaching is completely identified with the teacher. The entire doctrine of Christ, His beautiful Beatitudes, His timely and monumental commandments of Love of God and of our fellowman clearly expressed in the "Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man"—which is so appropriate today all over the world—took on meaning at the Resurrection, which is "victory over pain, sin, and death." Resurrection

is the victory song of Christianity. As a great historian once remarked, "I do not know what happened on the first Easter morning, but I do know that on that very day a new humanity was born which will never die and Time has made contact with Eternity."

There is no excuse for educators, especially after two thousand years of Christian civilization, not to distinguish between that which is permanent evaluating and upholding human dignity and that which is an adaptation to needs of place and time. The inspiration and orientation behind every Catholic educator—in fact, behind every educator—should come from the Victory Song of Christianity, the Resurrection of Christ. There is a great danger, and we know it, to lose sight of one's role in life in the midst of plenty. You are meeting at a time when humanity has accomplished much in the field of science, technology, and research, and yet, ironically, two-thirds of the earth's population go to bed every night with hunger pains. In the wealthiest country in the world that has distributed billions, a war on poverty has been declared. Let not educators miss this grand opportunity to make a vital contribution to the welfare of our nation and of mankind. An education based and inspired by our Judaeo-Christian heritage is the only type that will proclaim and uphold the value and dignity of each and every human person. Remember and reread those magnificent letters written by our Holy Father, John XXIII, *Mater et Magistra* (Mother and Teacher) and *Pacem in Terris* (Peace on Earth), in which is stated in bold letters the dignity and destiny of each man.

Yes, we are undergoing certain difficulties in our educational system—lack of funds, space, and teachers—but they are not insurmountable and, honestly, they are not any greater than when our unique and enviable educational system began more than a hundred years ago. Today, we are proud of Our Blessed Mother Seton and in her very sister who graces the classroom, proud of our brothers and priests who are the direct descendants of those noble pioneers of our educational system. Let us not minimize or undersell our magnificent and generous lay people who are taking an ever greater part in the life of the Church and who have carried the double burden of taxation for so many years in order to maintain our unique position in education in this free country of ours. Before World War II, one school-age child in twelve was in a Catholic school. Now, there is one in seven. Attendance in Catholic schools has increased 125 percent as compared to less than 50 percent in public schools. Would this have happened if our schools had failed or been found wanting? Let us not panic and eliminate certain grades, or become selective and ruin the school system our people have established in sacrifice and generosity. Let us by ecumenical in vision, spirit, and generosity. This is an ecumenical age.

You, the inspired and dedicated educators, can make a tremendous contribution in maintaining our high standard of the educational system and increasing its efficacy in the community and in the world. How can we not be inspired, also, when we encounter in Africa, in South America and Asia our own sisters, brothers, and priests teaching there in the language of the place? This great American nation established by the founding Fathers who were religious men need and demand a sound religious school system. If there is one single factor that brought pilgrims, founding fathers, and others to this soil, it was precisely religion. Education divorced from religion is a betrayal far worse than Benedict Arnold's. The imminent danger is secularism which breeds discrimination in race, creed, and employment. The victory banner of the Resurrection, which puts a seal on all the teachings of Christ, must be carried by every individual, by every educator, in order to secure peace, happiness, and joy among us.

Catholic Education and National Needs

THE MOST REVEREND JOHN J. DOUGHERTY, D.D.

*Auxiliary Bishop, Newark, New Jersey;
President, Seton Hall University*

IT IS THE PURPOSE of this convention to make a significant contribution to the continuing education of the community of Catholic educators. The purpose of this opening assembly is to provide an inspiration that hopefully will light the fires of the mind and the heart, establish the mood of our encounter, and create the climate conducive to the proper conducting of our affairs. When the morning oratory is done, we shall disassemble and become engaged in studies and judgments in our separate areas of Catholic education. Encouraged and stimulated by words spoken here, we shall get down to work.

Our meeting takes on a singular importance and peculiar urgency because of the mounting crisis in Catholic education. I do not intend to depict the crisis at length. It is familiar to you, for it is *your* crisis. It stares you in the face. It may, however, be expedient to set in relief the urgency of the crisis by recalling an action recently taken and a proposal newly made because of it. On February 10, 1964, the Board of Consultors of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati recommended the elimination of the first grade in all parish schools of the archdiocese. The recommendation was adopted by the Archbishop and will go into effect in September, 1964. Ten thousand Catholic children will take their first-grade studies in public schools. They will be given religious instruction in vacation schools. This action was forced upon the diocese by grave economic and academic considerations.

A recent *Saturday Evening Post* article on the crisis in the Catholic schools carried the banner line: "Many Catholics wonder: Are parochial schools obsolete?" The question merits more serious consideration when it is put to us by an American bishop in his foreword to a book just published: "Given the modern religious climate of the United States, is the Catholic educational system, as we know it, necessary or even desirable?" The book is Mary Perkins Ryan's *Are Parochial Schools the Answer?* She proposes that they are not and sees "the continuance or the extension of the Catholic school system . . . [as] an obstacle" to the essential mission of the contemporary Church in America. The action taken and the proposal published will suffice, I trust, to render acute the sense of crisis in Catholic education. Elementary education is the first to feel the impact, but Catholic secondary and higher education also have their problems. Add to these the grave and growing problem of Catholics on secular campuses and the total burden is far from light.

Confronting many crucial problems of their own, Catholic educators dare not forget that the nation has crucial problems, too. A few years ago *Life* magazine carried a series entitled "The National Purpose." It may help to bring our national needs into focus if we recall some of the judgments passed on the condition of the nation by several distinguished Americans.

Walter Lippman wrote: "The critical weakness of our society is that for the time being our people do not have great purposes which they are united in

wanting to achieve. . . . We talk about ourselves these days as if we were a completed society, one which has achieved its purposes and has no further great business to transact." In our youth we were a nation of great purposes.

Clinton Rossiter asked the question: "Can a nation that has fulfilled the mission of its youth expect to find a second mission in its later years? And can a nation that has known the material success of ours shake loose from the clutch of self-indulgence? Once we were lean and hungry, a people 'on the make,' and we generated a sense of mission almost instinctively in order to survive and move ahead. Now we are fat and complacent, a people that 'has it made,' and we find it hard to rouse to the trumpet of sacrifice—even if anyone in authority were to blow it." Another put it more pithily: "Part of our problem is how to stay awake on a full stomach."

The truth is that destiny has placed our nation in the middle of the world stage, and we are uncertain of the part we are to play. We must begin by realizing that our national purposes cannot be separated from the needs of the rest of the world. Adlai Stevenson observed that mankind is in acute need of "a convincing working model of a free society." Does our nation provide it? Hear his judgment: "The face which we present to the world—especially through our mass communications media—is the face of the individual or the family as a high consumption unit with minimal social responsibilities—father happily drinking his favorite beer, mother dreamily fondling soft garments newly rinsed in a wonderful new detergent, and children gaily calling from the barbecue pit for a famous sauce for their steak. . . . With the supermarket as our temple and the singing commercial as our library, are we likely to fire the world with an irresistible vision of America's exalted purposes and inspiring way of life?"

This is the face of America that goes out to meet the faces of the world. Have we done any better in shaping our environment? It is the judgment of Mr. Rossiter that "no people in history has ever had to put up with so much vulgarity, bad taste and ugliness in its surroundings. . . . We have the wealth and leisure and techniques to make a great culture an essential part of our lives, an inspiration to the world, and a monument to future generations—and we have not even come close to the mark."

If the mass of American citizens is retreating from social responsibilities into lives of private joys, indulgences, and excesses, can we presume the survival of freedom? The free society in America or anywhere does not survive automatically once established, like the movement of an atmospheric clock. The life of freedom, like the life of a man, depends on the observance of the laws of survival. The free society does not exist in a vacuum or in a neutral world. It exists in a hostile world of tyrannies aching to devour it. It must continually prove that it is capable of survival. Its people must continue to prove their capacity to practice "the disciplined virtues" which are the sinews of the free society. The nation must continue to receive a supply of dedicated people, which are its very soul. It needs always "the devotion of free, rational, responsible individuals" (J. W. Gardner).

Although a diagnosis of the moral tone of a nation as vast and complex as America is an enterprise of uncertain validity, the attempt must nevertheless be made. A society that does not subject itself to self-examination is on the way to becoming a worthless society. Therefore, we have presented the judgments of serious, intelligent, and dedicated citizens on the condition of our society. From these judgments a partial picture of our nation's needs emerges. Our nation needs men who remember that we owe our free society to certain timeless

beliefs about the nature of man, society, and government, and that our contribution to the survival of the free society is the exercise of the disciplined virtues. America needs men who are aroused by the disturbing evidence of the mass retreat from civic and social responsibilities to lives of private ease and indulgence—aroused *enough* to face about and reverse the trend. If the environment we have shaped is cheap and vulgar, we need men and women to reshape it. If the face we show the world is fat, soft, and comfortable, we need men made lean by intellectual and moral discipline. Do we, as Americans and Catholics, hear the cry of our country's needs and burn to respond? Can our educational tradition help? It is renowned for its intellectual discipline, for commitment to law and moral standards, for the exercise of rational restraint: these are precisely the nation's needs.

Catholic educators will better understand their potential contribution to the nation if they are more fully aware of the present position of the Catholic community in America. This awareness is not possible without a sense of history. When the first diocese in the United States was established in 1789, the Church of Rome found itself confronting a totally new experience. For the first time in almost 1800 years it was to exist under a government founded upon a Constitution and Bill of Rights that provided for separation of church and state. How did the Church fare with this new experience? More than a century later, Cardinal Gibbons said in an address at the Catholic University:

If I had the privilege of modifying the Constitution of the United States, I would not expunge or altar a single paragraph, a single line, or a single word of that important instrument. The Constitution is admirably adapted to the growth and expansion of the Catholic religion, and the Catholic religion is admirably adapted to the genius of the Constitution. They fit together like two links in the same chain.

The Cardinal's words were an echo of Archbishop Carroll's, who declared in 1784: "America may come to exhibit a proof to the world, that general and equal toleration, by giving free circulation to fair argument, is the most effectual method to bring all denominations of Christians to a unity of faith."

When this Republic was young, the Catholic minority had no admittance "to the circles where, both in politics and in letters, the American mind was being shaped." The American mind and culture were Protestant, and such they remained throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. That period witnessed the rise of the Church of the immigrants. Monsignor Ellis has termed it the "heroic age," "heroic in the struggle and ordeal of bishops, priests, and laymen . . . [who] striving amid an unfriendly environment to achieve the well nigh impossible goal of providing a Catholic setting for the millions of immigrants who landed on these shores."¹

That heroic age is past, but it must ever be remembered, for to its heroes we owe our faith. They did more than keep the faith alive. They achieved the system of the Catholic education by a voluntary effort which, in the judgment of Christopher Dawson, has "no parallel elsewhere in the world."

After the depression of the late twenties, Protestantism was no longer the dominant religion in America, practically identified with its culture, and in 1959 a Protestant historian could admit that Catholicism had at last become part of the American culture. The present position of the Catholic community in a

¹ American Catholicism in 1960: An Historical Perspective," *American Benedictine Review*, 1960, 1-2).

pluralist America calls for dedication different from that of our immigrant forefathers. The Catholic community stands today as an equal partner in the American experiment, and it must recognize and accept the demands of its new posture. This was recognized by the National Catholic Educational Association at its annual meeting in 1960. In one of its resolutions it urged that Catholic schools strive "to find increasingly effective ways of developing within their students a deep sense of social responsibility, and particularly of their responsibilities as Catholics within a pluralistic society." It is high time for all of us to come to a deeper understanding of the American society of which we are a part, time to come to a higher esteem of its value and to a fuller realization of the meaning of the experience of the Catholic Church within this society. What an exciting thing it is to be Catholic and American! Behold the vitality and vigor of the Church in America! Sense the stirring of its intellectual energies! To be thoroughly Catholic and thoroughly American—that is the present demand set before the Catholic community.

Knowledge of the changed conditions of our free society and the altered position of the Catholic community within it should give the Catholic educator a clearer perception of his responsibilities. It is furthermore desirable that the Catholic educator possess a rich and full understanding of his Christian cultural heritage from the Old World. As an immigrant community, Catholics were cut off from the knowledge and appreciation of that heritage. An educated Catholic community can now enter into its inheritance. Should not that heritage ultimately exert a strong influence on the American civilization through an educated Catholic community? Christopher Dawson was bold enough to state that if the "forty million Catholics in this country were aware of their cultural strength, there is no power in the land that could equal them."²

We shall soon disperse to take up our separate tasks. Do we share a concept that will unify our work and unite us working? Is it not the concept of Christian humanism? The Catholic educator is one who recognizes human culture as a value in its own right and worthy of pursuit for the good of the individual and the good of society. This recognition is shared by the secular humanist, who is also "very interested in the present world, in making it a better place in which to live, in finding out what works best in it, in trying to make as many people as possible happy within it."³

What distinguishes the Christian humanist from the secular humanist is his larger view of reality, the extent of his vision of human existence. It embraces not only the science of man, but the mystery of man. He sees human culture as consonant with supernatural faith and moral idealism. He is convinced that it is possible for a Catholic to be a free and responsible educator, convinced that his search for truth can be as real and honest as that of the secular humanist or the scientist. He also feels that Christian humanism may contribute some cultural distinctiveness to a society that is fast becoming so culturally homogeneous.

The goal of Christian humanism is to humanize, to contribute to the maturing of the intellect and to the moral freedom of a man. It shares its goal with the liberal arts which are designed to free a man from ignorance and obscurantism, bias and prejudice, the darkly visaged enemies of all freedom. Rarely does one come upon a complete humanist. I should consider it a quality of the true

² *The Critic*, June-July, 1959.

³ Michael Novak, "Catholics in College," *Commonweal*, January 25, 1963.

humanist to consider himself incomplete, as one who views his efforts to humanize others as a means to his own humanization.

Not only is the humanist incomplete, his humanism itself is unfinished. The debate about twin cultures proves at least this—that the scientific culture and the humanist culture are as yet unwed, and who can doubt the relevance of science to a true contemporary humanism? Humanism is unfinished in another sense. The cultural inheritance of the Western world must be reviewed from time to time in the light of the developmental character of human knowledge. That which is outworn must be discarded; treasures neglected must be newly appraised. How dramatically that principle is illustrated by the biblical and liturgical renaissance! How much biblical literalism has been discarded! How many liturgical treasures have been recovered! It is not the pastness of the past that is significant, but its presence, as T. S. Eliot has expressed it.

The advantage of the Christian humanist lies in the enlargement of his experience of existence by virtue of his faith, in the recognition of the supernatural order and the concomitant religious experience. Another advantage lies in his viewpoint on the human predicament, which may be described as pessimism restrained by optimism. The Christian humanist balks at the theatre of the absurd and its "mercilessly derisive image" of man. He exults rather in the Psalmist's image:

You have made him little less than the angels,
And crowned him with glory and honor.
You have given him rule over the works of your hands,
Putting all things under his feet. (8:6f)

Or in the image of Shakespeare: "What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a god! The beauty of the world! The paragon of animals" (*Hamlet*).

A characteristic mark of our time is concern for the person and his rights. The secular humanist is vitally concerned with the person, and often serves his cause with an energy and dedication that puts the Catholic to shame. Can the Christian humanist of any age forget the value of the person when Christ has identified himself with even the least of them? Can the Christian educator not identify himself or herself with the child, the adolescent, the college youth? If Christ calls us friends, shall we not call our students friends? Can a Catholic educator be a Christian humanist without these ideals? Can he be a Christian without them?

There is ample argument to confirm the wide prevalence of secular humanism in America's colleges and universities, and there is reason to believe that it dominates broad areas of public elementary and secondary education. It is the conviction of this Catholic educator that the national needs will best be served by the survival of a strong Christian humanism. The crisis in Catholic education, therefore, takes on a peculiar gravity, for we live with the question: "Can the Christian humanism survive without some system of Catholic education?" The answer must be sought in the stuff of reality, not "in the stuff that dreams are made of."

I shall now present my concluding summary in a series of questions:

Since we are no longer a minority group, should we not cast off altogether minority group attitudes and the ghetto mentality?

Since we are inheritors of the Catholic culture of Europe, can we do less than use it creatively and wisely?

Since we are Americans, shall we not prize our free society on its own merits and for its own sake?

Since we are but once removed from the Church of the immigrants, can we presume that we are emotionally secure, intellectually mature, and spiritually integrated?

Since we are sharers in God's vision for mankind in Christ, can we afford not to penetrate the essence of that mystery more deeply and live it more fully?

Since we are identified with Christ in His body through baptism, can we forget that we are identified with our students who are members of that same body?

Since we are the generation of the Ecumenical Council, can we forget the example of good Pope John or the question of Pope Paul, "Church of Christ! What dost thou think of thyself?" For us at this time in this place, that question is thus turned: "Community of Catholic educators! What think you of yourselves?"

The Layman and the Schools

JOHN W. MCDEVITT

Supreme Knight, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Connecticut

OUT OF THE FEVER AND TEMPO of political campaigns come slogans and appraisals which have a faculty at times of becoming prophetic. In the Kennedy-Nixon campaign the phrase "New Frontier" had more than mere campaign frosting in its implication.

The phrase New Frontier is no longer a flight of rhetoric. Modern science both aeronautical and electronic has devoured distance and made neighbors of us all. Isolationism is now impossible for a nation of any size or importance. In one way or another the hydrogen bomb will make all men brothers; we will unite in life or we will be consumed in a world wide holocaust.

What is true worldwide and nationally is applicable with equal force as we live among those who, together with ourselves, carry the responsibility of the future of this nation and the world.

A criticism is made, and sometimes not incorrectly, that parochial schools ghettoed themselves in fear and self-defense by withdrawing from social and artistic movements in the days when anticlericism and modernism in general made the future of our Church look dark. Because of this withdrawal, too many good features of our world developed without the influence of Catholics, or even in spite of the spirited opposition of Catholics. It occurs to me that, in the light of today's problems and challenges, our parochial schools cannot afford to content themselves in keeping their schools parochial in outlook. Such isolationism could be disastrous. It would endanger the safety of the social welfare of the community, and at the same time it would seriously compromise our Church by giving the erroneous impression, intentionally or not, that this type of thinking represents the Catholic point of view.

The successors of St. Peter have spoken out against such a spirit. I regret to say that sometimes only non-Catholics are surprised that many of us act as if we have never heard of such papal pronouncements or, if we have heard them, we still ignore them.

At long last, the thesis that a durable democracy is founded on an educated people has come true. What was the privilege of a few in the days of Concord and Lexington is the birthright of all in the days of Cape Kennedy and Oak Ridge.

In this evolution of education the greatest social miracle has been the emergence of the private and parochial schools. The Church's days as a pioneer are over, and graduates of her schools will now be accepted or rejected on their own merits. No longer are these schools in competition with each other nor do they stand as a challenge to our public schools.

The duality of education in America has been accomplished and is protected by Constitutional guarantees and Supreme Court decisions. Our Catholic schools have gradually conquered all obstacles, some of which were not

of their own making and concerning which all true Americans regret their undemocratic sources.

In Catholic schools, patriotism, obedience to the laws, and loyalty to the Constitution are taught as a religion even more than a civic duty, and the best and highest ideals of American patriotism and citizenship are exalted. This does not mean that we can sleep in the tents of our fathers. The world is advancing, there are challenges before us, and like true soldiers of Christ we are ready to meet them.

Catholic education is in a period of crisis. This is not a shocking or even a suprising statement. It would be much more astonishing for me to say Catholic education is in a period of normalcy, or all is well in the Catholic school. We have come to accept the fact that ours is an age of crisis; we live in the context of overlapping periods of anxiety with regard to the domestic economy, international relations, conflicting ideologies. Although in such an atmosphere it is difficult to alert ourselves to a new crisis, there is every reason to underscore the acute nature of the present phase of the crisis in Catholic education and to give thoughtful consideration to proposed solutions to at least some of the problems that confront us.

There is considerable evidence to show that the plight of Catholic education has been recognized not only locally and regionally, but nationally; not only by the Catholic but by the non-Catholic public. This recognition is based not merely on casual interest or curiosity but on genuine concern over a problem which is truly national in its dimensions and universal in its implications. Just as the question of racial integration in the schools affects more than the Negro population, so the future of Catholic education becomes of concern to all American citizens. The public is financially involved because of the substantial amount saved the taxpayer annually by virtue of the operation of our Catholic schools. The public is equally concerned about the additional tax burden which would fall on their shoulders as a result of the possible curtailment of certain grades in our Catholic schools. More significantly, however, the public is concerned with the education of Catholic boys and girls as future responsible citizens in this democracy.

Evidence of this national concern may be gleaned from an analysis of the treatment of Catholic education in the news media. Not too many years ago the discussion of problems in Catholic education was largely limited to Catholic periodicals relatively unknown to the general population, including the Catholic population. Gradually, the diocesan newspaper began to feature educational news and analyses on the editorial page and eventually on the front page. More recently the secular press has recognized the newsworthiness of the events in Catholic education. Similarly the popular magazines—*Life*, *Time*, *Saturday Evening Post*, *Look*, among others—have featured articles dealing with various aspects of the crisis in Catholic schools. Finally, the Columbia Broadcasting System recently devoted an hour of prime time to "The Catholics and the Schools," presenting various views on the question of federal aid to private schools and on alternate solutions to problems affecting Catholic education.

Concurrent with this phenomenon of popular concern with the problems of Catholic education, one finds an equal or greater interest in the evolution of the ecumenical movement and, more specifically, in the work of the Second Vatican Council, the far-reaching implications of which have made its deliberations front-page news in most daily newspapers. One of the persistent concerns of the Council is the reexamination of the role of the Catholic layman in ecclesiastical life, with the resultant emergence of the laity from

a relatively passive to a more active participation in all of the activities of the Church. The concurrence of these two phenomena—the crisis in Catholic education and the emerging role of the layman—would seem to be providential rather than accidental. There seems to be little doubt that the laity will play an increasingly active and constructive role in the resolving of the conflict in Catholic education if that conflict is to be resolved at all. It may be well to consider some of the factors underlying the contemporary emergence of the laity in Catholic life against a background of issues relating to the present crisis in Catholic education, then to project some thoughts with regard to the future role of the layman in the Catholic school.

The nature of the crisis in Catholic education seems at first glance to be associated with finances and numbers. In less time than it takes a student to reach his majority the enrollment in your schools has doubled. One need not be a financial expert to appreciate the magnitude of this responsibility placed on the already overburdened Catholic school by this phenomenal growth in school enrollment.

A second aspect of the problem has been the critical shortage of qualified teachers. While the number of religious vocations could not possibly keep up with the demand for teaching priests, sisters, and brothers, our Catholic schools are in no position to compete with the public school for the services of professionally qualified laymen and women.

The increase in school population, the rising costs of construction and maintenance, the inability of Church schools to secure qualified lay teachers in sufficient numbers—these factors have precipitated a crisis of major proportions. But interestingly enough, these problems have stimulated debate concerning a more fundamental issue, namely, the essential nature and purpose of Catholic education. It is not uncommon for us to question our basic philosophical premises at times of crisis, and perhaps only at times of crisis. Two world wars prompted us to redefine our national goals, our systems of values. The great depression of three decades ago caused us to review our basic economic structure. Similarly the present situation in the schools causes us to initiate a searching inquiry into the philosophy of Catholic education, to distinguish clearly between the essentials and the accidentals, to define sharply the needs and responsibilities, the functions of Church, home, and school, the roles of religious and laity. The pursuit of these questions now going on, and likely to continue for some time, has already engendered a variety of plans calculated to solve the dilemmas facing you as administrators. There are those who, convinced that Catholics cannot adequately support education at all levels, suggest curtailing if not abandoning education at the elementary level in order to concentrate on the improvement of Catholic education, both quantitatively and qualitatively, at the secondary and higher levels. Their argument is based on the belief that the more sensitive, controversial areas in curricular content are introduced at the secondary level and that, therefore, the education of a mature, well-informed, responsible Catholic occurs primarily at the adolescent level and during the college years. That this proposal, radical as it may have seemed a few years ago, is no longer merely theoretical was dramatically shown even this month when diocesan papers announced in banner headlines: **FIRST GRADE CLASSES ELIMINATED IN CINCINNATI'S CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.** The news release continued:

Parish elementary schools of the Cincinnati archdiocese will drop the first grade beginning next September in an effort to solve the problems of rising cost and enrollment. The Cincinnati archdiocese is the first United

States See to drop the first grade on an across-the-board basis, though grades have been dropped in individual Catholic schools in scattered areas throughout the country.

This news story must have caused surprise to some and anguish to others who have taken a different view of the proposed solution to current problems. Basing their argument on the view that the years of childhood are the most impressionable, that one's attitudes of mind and heart are formed during these years, this group would concentrate on the improvement of education at the elementary level.

A third school of thought is represented by those who reject both of the above arguments as inadequate, and who would, consequently, continue the present effort, at whatever cost, to provide the best possible education at all levels for as many Catholic youth as possible. Within this group would be found those who recognize the need for and feasibility of a compromise in the nature of a shared-time program wherein educational responsibility is shared by the public school and the Catholic school.

One would be rash who would pretend to have the wisdom necessary to perceive the right solution at this stage of the debate. It is, however, our intention to underline the fact that such thoughts and plans must be recognized as parts of the context in which any discussion of the role of the layman, or for that matter the religious, must be conducted.

Any policy ultimately adopted will, in effect, depend on constant and constructive cooperation among all interested parties: administrators and teachers, whether diocesan, religious or lay, and the Catholic public. Such cooperation should probably be effected not only at the local or parochial level, not only at the regional or diocesan level, but to some extent at the national level. Specific operational policies must inevitably be formulated and promulgated at the local and diocesan levels, much as public school policies depend on community and state rather than federal direction. However, it might be wise to suggest that a national commission be appointed to serve in an advisory capacity for all Catholic school systems throughout the fifty states. Such a commission would include representatives of all parties concerned; yet it would not attempt to compete with any presently existing agency, nor would it hold any mandate to coerce or to direct any course of action. Its function would be to collect and disseminate information on every phase of the present problem and to offer counsel where and when it might be desired with regards to any of the dimensions of the issue before us. This commission would help to coordinate and unify attempts of diocesan and local groups to solve current problems. It would not attempt to demonstrate that what is being done in Cincinnati or Pittsburgh should be done in Davenport or in Sacramento, but it would facilitate the exchange of information, both descriptive and evaluative, about action taken in any diocese. It would not solve the problems, but it might aid in their solution. The National Catholic Educational Association, which has already done so much at both the national and sectional levels to stimulate discussion of significant educational issues, might well assume a position of leadership in organizing and aiding the work of this proposed commission.

There is little doubt that the laity will assume a more active role in the future of Catholic education. The fact that vocations to the priesthood and to the religious life will not occur in numbers sufficient to provide for the personnel requirements of your schools would in itself assure us of this. But more significant is the current reexamination of the role of the layman

alluded to earlier. Any consideration of the future must, inevitably, be placed in the context of the past. It is common knowledge that the layman's position in Catholic education has traditionally been inferior with respect to responsibility, prestige, and recognition. As Father Neil McCluskey observes: "Though from the beginning laymen and laywomen have taught in Catholic schools, their role has, until fairly recent times, been completely subordinate."¹ The key to an understanding of this subordinate status may be found in the fact that lay persons were commonly regarded as substitutes for religious. Underlying this attitude perhaps was the impression that the training and, therefore, the function of the lay teacher was intrinsically different from that of the religious. The effect of this assumed difference in status was that the layman rarely, if ever, had a voice in the formulation of policy. Not only was he not allowed to assume any administrative responsibility but, more often than not, he was not consulted in policy-making decisions. As a teacher he was, and is today, generally underpaid. In a kind of vicious circle, his relatively low remuneration accounted for his lack of qualification, and his lack of qualification justified his low remuneration. One who accepted a teaching position in a Catholic school, for whatever reason, could ill afford full-time, high quality professional preparation: lacking this, he could not expect to be rewarded on a par with those who had received adequate training. It was not uncommon to find lay teachers in the Catholic schools who had not completed course requirements for the baccalaureate, or who were deficient in academic or professional credits minimally required for certification in the profession. One might point out, parenthetically, that this situation did not obtain exclusively in the Catholic school. A shortage of qualified teachers continues to plague many public as well as private schools.

But times have changed. For several years, there have been indications that the status of the layman in Catholic education was scheduled for review. As far back as 1938, Monsignor Thomas Quigley pointed out, in a thesis submitted at the Catholic University of America, that the exclusion of the lay teacher from the Catholic school was originally an emergency measure due to the lack of adequate funds to provide for salaries. "The common opinion among Catholics today," he wrote, "that the Religious are able to satisfy the demand and that we can dismiss the lay teacher from our mind as a 'negligible' quantity is a grossly erroneous opinion. To maintain it is to refuse to face facts." Monsignor Quigley continued: "Those who see no valid reason for adopting a sane and permanent policy toward the lay teacher are overlooking (a) the fact that even the present status could not be maintained without them, (b) that future expansion will make them more necessary, (c) that a complete exclusion of the laity from our schools—even were it possible—would be contrary (1) to the mind of the Church, (2) to the spirit of Catholic action, (3) to our own best interest."²

The past twenty-five years have seen these statements restated and reaffirmed consistently. With the expansion of the Catholic school system, the number of lay teachers increased rapidly, particularly after the Second World War. As Father McCluskey observes, "A noiseless revolution has been under way for some years in the faculty structure of the Catholic schools."³ Statistics will bear out the revolutionary nature of change here, if not verify its

¹ NEIL G. MCCLUSKEY, S.J., *Catholic Viewpoint in Education* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House), 1959, p. 104.

² THOMAS J. QUIGLEY, "The Lay Teacher in the American School System," (Unpublished Master's thesis, Catholic University of America), 1938, p. 79.

³ MCCLUSKEY, *op.cit.*

noiseless character. From 1946 to 1959, the number of lay teachers in Catholic elementary schools increased from 2,168 to 22,051, representing an 800 percent increase over that period. By 1960, lay teachers constituted 29 percent of the staff in elementary schools. At the secondary level, the years 1946 to 1959 saw an increase of lay teachers from 3,752 to 9,055. Provocative and significant is the prediction, based on statistical projection, made by Sister Rose Matthew that by the year 1971, lay teachers will outnumber priests and religious in Catholic education.

It would be interesting to speculate on the reasons for this rather startling phenomenon. In the absence of adequate research data, suggested hypotheses would merely be speculative. It would be safe to say, however, that many lay members of the faculties of Catholic schools were employed out of necessity, just as lay teachers had once been excluded through necessity. It is at the same time reasonable to suppose that the practical reasons for the employment of lay teachers were conditioned by the continuing reappraisal of the role of the laity in Catholic education. It is this new estimate of the proper function of the layman that should be stressed in the present and future rather than the fact, incontrovertible as it is, that the continuance of Catholic education demands the employment of greater numbers of lay teachers.

What is this "new estimate"? What does the Catholic lay person look like in the light of Catholic Action, or the ecumenical movement, or the Second Vatican Council? Well, he doesn't wear a cassock or any sort of religious dress; but if you look closely you find that he looks amazingly like a priest, or sister, or brother. At least there is a strong family resemblance.

This is not too surprising. They do belong to the same family. They are all members of the Mystical Body of Christ. Through baptism, confirmation, and the Holy Eucharist, they share in the same sacramental life; they share, indeed, the priesthood of Christ. This is the simple yet profound truth that makes of the layman not a spectator but a participant, not something apart but a part of something, a part of everything that is the life of the Church. It gives him an active role in the apostolic mission which includes, of course, the mission to teach.

If we accept this new, or perhaps one should say *renewed* concept of the role of the layman in the Church, we shall not immediately resolve all problems affecting the layman's status and function in the Catholic Church and, specifically, in Catholic education. On the contrary we shall encounter new problems or new dimensions of old problems. However close the members of the Catholic educational community may be, however much they may be willing to cooperate, a priest is still a priest, a religious a religious, and a layman a layman. Even as we stress similarities we must recognize differences—differences in background, in training and education, in point of view which may suggest differences in teaching function. Sensitive as we are to problems which may arise, may we project some thoughts concerning the role of the layman in Catholic education in the future?

THE ROLE OF THE LAYMAN IN THE FUTURE

First, it would seem reasonable to suggest that the lay teacher be given increased responsibility in decision making at the administrative level. Not only would this be advisable because of the rising percentage of lay teachers in Catholic education, but more significantly a policy which would actively

solicit the opinion of the lay teacher would tend to identify him more intimately with the educational enterprise, to make him an integral part of the Catholic school rather than a temporary teacher, a mere employee, or, as in former times, a substitute teacher. There is no doubt that the experience would be mutually profitable for the school and for the teacher. For many laymen and women, there is little incentive to remain in a school in which the door to administrative opportunity is permanently locked. Even for the person who does not aspire to administrative office, a policy which respects and invites his opinion on curricular and instructional matters is likely to be most rewarding. This may well be one of the most critical factors in building up faculty morale—a necessary condition for a successful educational situation.

Secondly, liaison between the school and the home should be improved and strengthened. It is one of our great good fortunes in this democratic land that the prior rights of the family in matters educational are fundamentally recognized and confirmed by the courts. The child belongs to the family, not to the state nor to the school, and in this connection I may be pardoned for recalling the militant and successful leadership initiated by the Knights of Columbus in bringing the Oregon school case to the Supreme Court of these United States.

The problem of proper family-school relations is a complex one. No simple formula can be proposed for its solution. But it is a problem which must be relentlessly investigated and patiently pursued in all of its trying dimensions. Here again, the laity must be given opportunity to voice its opinion, to express its views. Today, the attitude of parents toward schools, both public and parochial, ranges from apathetic disinterest to what might be termed enthusiastic interference! Between these undesirable extremes, we need to find a way to effect constructive cooperation based on mutual respect, acceptance of each one's responsibilities, and recognition of each one's functions. Success in achieving good family-school relations would materially enhance the prestige of Catholic education, increase its chances of success, and, as a matter of fact, set a good example for some other schools to follow.

Thirdly, the lay members of school faculties must be more closely identified with the total instructional program. If Catholic education means anything at all, there is an implication that religion and morality are integrating themes permeating the entire educational experience. While it is evidently true that some curricular areas are more sensitive to the impact of Catholic thought than others—for instance, social studies rather than mathematics, literature rather than language arts—still, it is unwise to assign religious and moral responsibility to some members of the faculty and not to others. Every teacher in a Catholic school must share to some extent in the realization of the objectives for which the Catholic school is established. Again quoting Father McCluskey: "It need hardly be stated . . . that dedicated personalities, academic preparation, classroom competence, even religious influence itself, can be as much the possession of lay teachers as of religious teachers."⁴ It would seem essential that the Catholic school administrator recognize the fact that the lay teacher may have as much, even more influence on the religious and moral attitudes of children and adolescents than the religious teacher; it is equally essential that the lay teacher also recognize this fact and accept the implied responsibility.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

Finally, in the "much easier said than done" category, there is no doubt that adequate remuneration must be provided to attract qualified lay teachers and to retain them in Catholic education. While there are a number of Catholic college graduates who are willing to devote a year or two to the lay apostolate by donating their services for that length of time, Catholic education cannot depend on the generosity of a few to continue its many-sided functions. Nor can it be expected, in the context of the present-day economy, that a layman or woman dedicate himself or herself permanently to the cause of Catholic education at a substantial lifetime financial sacrifice. Where the discrepancy between public and Catholic school salaries is large, it is unlikely that Catholic schools can hope to maintain education both in quantity and quality, particularly in view of the demand for more lay teachers. Here the facts are clear; the problem is evident; the solution awaits our research and action.

Catholic education has made remarkable progress at all levels over the past century, progress all the more remarkable to anyone who is acquainted with the historical context in which Catholic education developed. We are all familiar with some of the material and psychological forces which served as obstacles both to the establishment and to the prosperity of Catholic schools. It is not mere platform oratory to cite the heroic efforts of the hierarchy, of the clergy, of the sisters, of the brothers, of the laymen and laywomen who have brought Catholic education along to its present status and who have made significant and lasting contributions to education and welfare in the United States. It is only fair and just to acknowledge these facts even as we point up the deficiencies, the problems confronting Catholic education today.

In America, Catholicism has flourished as it has not in any other section of the world. In a country blessed with material and spiritual resources, American Catholics have been able to contribute significantly not only to the mission of the Church here but throughout the world. Is it not true that American Catholics have a special role, a particular destiny to fulfill? May we not hope that all American Catholics, the hierarchy, the clergy, the religious, the laity can work together to achieve the goals set for them? If personal sacrifice has been the essential quality in producing the achievements of the past, may we not urge that the spirit of sacrifice be rekindled in all of us to achieve even greater things in the future?

The Interdependence of Housing and Education

ROBERT C. WEAVER

*Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency,
Washington, D.C.*

I AM GLAD TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY to speak to this conference of educational leaders and practitioners. I have been an educator myself. Now, as a public official charged with directing federal programs for better homes and more livable communities, I find that a strong common denominator underlies the responsibilities of a housing administrator and an educator.

We both deal with human resources and needs. Many of the problems that confront you in the schoolroom stem from the problems in our homes and communities. Many of the community problems that confront us are the result of educational shortcomings and deficiencies.

I am sure you could tell me what we need to do in housing and community improvement to improve our educational progress. But since I have the floor, allow me to discuss some of the educational help needed to meet our housing and urban problems.

Our progress and our problems today arise from the same source—the nation's growth and advancement within less than half a century from an agrarian to a highly urbanized society. This has brought greater opportunities, higher living standards, more creative use of our human resources for most of our people, and has produced revolutionary changes in our economic and social institutions.

In the housing economy, the handicraft house has given way to the mass-produced suburbs. The Main Street town has become the freeway metropolis. We are busily re-shaping our older areas to adapt them to the complex needs of our urban future.

The changes in education have been no less profound. The little red schoolhouse that served us well during our transition from a wilderness into a highly industrialized world power is virtually extinct. It has been replaced by a network of specialized facilities and institutions geared to developing the finest scientists and statesmen and spacemen.

For most of our population, this has meant greater opportunities and better living. A majority of our people are homeowners, and the homes and apartments we produce today come fully equipped for living in a push-button world. The variety and scope of our educational offerings, whether we seek to be agriculturalists, artists, or astronauts, rival those of the supermarket. Within the past decade the median educational level of our population has risen 14 percent.

We can preen ourselves on our progress if we wish. We have much to crow about.

But medians are deceptive. They mirror our accomplishments, and mini-

mize our failures. And our failures today are more glaring and critical than ever.

Our urban centers are not only the citadels of our progress. They have also become the refuge for those who lack opportunity and the training necessary to keep pace with modern society and to function and participate in it. These are the people of poverty whose plight has prompted President Johnson's program to attack its causes on all fronts—"a struggle," as he calls it, "to give people a chance." These are the submerged millions in our slums, our ghettos, and on our welfare and unemployment rolls.

This problem is more critical today because the gap between opportunity and the lack of it is much greater. For the victims themselves, it is often unbridgeable. The chance for the poor to subsist on the land is virtually gone. Their hope today is in the cities to which they turn. Unskilled labor, however, provides only 8 percent of our work force today compared to 30 percent at the turn of the century, and it is dwindling. The untrained and the unskilled are the unemployed.

The solution to our problem of poverty, as the President's call asserts, involves the combined efforts of many forces—in housing, in health, in training and job opportunities, in civil rights, and in education and social guidance. It is a problem of opening doors of opportunity to these people. But it is also a problem of equipping them to use those opportunities. This is the task of the educator. For as Walter Lippman recently wrote, "The greatest of all causes of poverty is lack of education."

The interdependence of all our efforts to combat poverty is clear. We have 30 million people with money incomes who have only a grade-school education or less. Two-thirds of them have incomes below \$3,000 and live in poverty. We have 8½ million nonfarm families living in substandard housing. Two-thirds of them have poverty incomes of less than \$3,000.

One-fifth of the uneducated poor and nearly a third of the low-income in substandard housing are non-whites. In addition to being deprived of elemental learning and decent housing, they face the potent social blockade of racial discrimination.

More than a third of the heads of families with poverty-level incomes are 65 years or older, past their earning and their learning prime.

These people must be given help if they are to have hope. They are the unwilling wards of modern progress. The instruments and institutions that have built that progress must now be oriented to reducing and eliminating this deadweight of poverty on our society.

We consider it our task in housing and community improvement to help bring to the impoverished and disadvantaged the kind of homes and physical environment in which the full range of remedial efforts can be successfully applied and achieve lasting results. Fighting despair and social separation in the hopelessness of the slums is a losing battle for most of these people.

But there are two parts to the poverty equation. We must not only remove people from the oppressive blight of the slums and ghettos. We must also remove the human blight of social separation and educational deficiency from the people. Without the social guidance needed for improved standards of living and training and without educational opportunities to enable the people to enter the stream of employment and community participation, the benefits of a better physical environment will be largely dissipated.

When the Kennedy program for housing and urban improvement was developed three years ago, one of its prime objectives was to achieve new

breakthroughs in providing housing for the ill-housed. Public housing had been meeting part of the low-income need. It was essential that this program be continued, and the Housing Act of 1961 carried the largest public housing authorization in many years.

But there was also another serious gap that had developed in our housing economy above this public housing level. The incomes of many families had not kept pace with rising housing and land costs, and the housing being produced in the booming private market passed beyond the financial reach of an increasing number of these people. An increased supply of good housing for this moderate-income group was needed not only to arrest their housing impoverishment, but also to enable our cities to eliminate slums and restore their blighted areas where many of these low- and moderate-income families had to live.

The Housing Act of 1961, accordingly, initiated under the Federal Housing Administration new programs for lower-cost private and nonprofit housing for this in-between housing need. Legislative and administrative changes were also made in the urban renewal program to reduce its impact on low- and moderate-income families by increased use of rehabilitation in the renewal process and by providing a larger supply of moderate- and low-income housing in these reclaimed areas.

A broader and more effective attack was contained in the 1961 act for another area of housing need—that of the elderly. They faced the disadvantage of both limited income and age, and their housing requirements were quite different from the family needs that our standard programs were designed to serve. Under the 1961 act, a three-pronged approach to this housing problem was developed: through special FHA insurance on the private market; through federal loans for nonprofit housing for people of more limited means; and through public housing for the lower-income elderly.

The results of these programs for people of low or moderate income and for the elderly have been substantial and highly encouraging. In less than three years since the 1961 act was passed, some 110,000 sale or rental units for moderate-income needs have been or are being provided under the FHA's new programs. An additional 100,000 public housing units for the low-income group have been authorized, about half of them for the elderly. The three programs for housing for the elderly, including those in public housing, have produced authorizations totaling 100,000 units.

This is only a beginning, but it is a significant one. For the first time, during these three years, we have been able to channel, on a comprehensive front, a substantial part of our housing production to serve the needs of the most neglected segments of our population.

Another major step in breaching the walls of the slum and ghetto was taken in November, 1962, when President Kennedy issued his Executive Order on Equal Opportunity in Housing. This order required that all federally-supported housing, public or private, thenceforward must be open to all home-seekers, regardless of race, color, or creed. More than 600,000 units of housing immediately subject to this order have been or are being built, and the volume is steadily increasing.

Although only a part of the total housing market is affected by the order, it is an important part, particularly for those of limited resources. As non-whites move into this broader and freer market of better housing, we can expect profound changes not only in the rigid racial patterns of our urban communities, but also, we can hope, in the rigid patterns of acceptance that they have imposed on the attitudes in our urban neighborhoods.

One other activity that has been upgrading the housing of many slum-dwellers—and this may surprise some of you—is urban renewal. You frequently hear that urban renewal rebuilds blighted areas at the expense of the displaced poor. The record shows that, on the whole, this is untrue. Urban renewal projects to date are eliminating some quarter of a million substandard housing units, and more than three-fourths of those who live in them are now, or soon will be, living in decent standard housing.

Urban renewal, in fact, is the one program that, by law, has a positive responsibility to provide decent housing for those it displaces—and that does something about it.

Relocation is a difficult process. There have admittedly been failures and deficiencies in the relocation operations on many projects. We have acted to reduce and minimize these in the past few years through tighter requirements and accountability. Urban renewal often gets blamed for all the displacement that is occurring in our cities. We estimate, however, that less than half of the displacement caused by public action and improvements, to say nothing of private construction, results from urban renewal.

The inroads now being made on the problems of the slums and the rehousing of the disadvantaged and the poor do not constitute the complete answer. There is still much to be done. President Johnson has called on Congress this year for further legislation to do more of the job. He has called for a four-year extension of public housing, since the present authorization for this program has been fully used. His proposal would permit utilizing existing as well as new housing for low-income needs, and make it possible to step up the rate of rehousing low-income families from 35,000 to 60,000 units a year.

The proposed continuation of public housing is being attacked by the same hard-core opposition that has fought it since it started more than twenty-five years ago. Their reasoning is rather baffling. On the one hand, they maintain that since public housing, even with subsidy, is unable to house more than a limited number of the poorest of the poor, it is failing in its mission. On the other hand, they maintain that subsidized public housing is the wrong way to house any of the poor anyway. The fact is that there is no present alternative, except the slums, for housing many of the millions of low-income people who live at or below the poverty level.

The President's housing and community improvement proposals would also provide some important new aids to the left-out segments of the housing market. It would furnish additional help to displaced families and small businesses to enable them to adjust to a new location and environment, and to help people of limited means to obtain moderate-cost housing in the community. It would facilitate more rehabilitation and more low- and moderate-income housing in renewal areas, and would extend special help to elderly homeowners to improve and retain their homes in areas being rehabilitated.

The physical changes in the environment of these people is only part of the equation. The other part is the human change that results. What happens when the slum dweller moves at last into a decent home? What takes place when the moving van pulls away? Does he suddenly adjust to a more responsible, productive role in his community? Are his hopes renewed, his work skills improved, his social attitudes broadened? Do his children become eager students in school? Is a wholesome family relationship established?

No, I don't think these things necessarily follow. It isn't that automatic. Sometimes, in fact, the relocated family finds itself more confused in a new and better neighborhood than it did in the slums to which it had been accus-

tomed. The relocated family needs more than just a better place to live. It also needs to learn a better way to live. In achieving this, it usually needs all the help and understanding it can get from the social agencies, the church, the school, the neighbors, and the citizens of the community generally.

We have been seeking, in cooperation with local community services and other federal welfare and social programs, to develop this kind of follow-up in the community for those who make the move from slums to decent housing. In the two cities, for example, St. Louis and New Haven, the Public Housing Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have joined forces, in conjunction with local administrative and educational institutions, to develop a coordinated package of social, economic, and educational services for tenants in public housing.

In both of these experimental programs, the findings disclose that lack of elemental education is a basic deterrent to efforts to improve the economic and social status of many of these families. In a St. Louis project, with 4,000 adults and twice that many children, many of them immigrants from rural areas of the South, nearly half of the adults twenty-five years or older have less than a grade-school education. In a New Haven project, 10 percent of the adults lack the elementary reading and writing capacity essential for further training and development. Educational programs at the most elementary level have been proposed as the first essential in the rehabilitation of these residents in their new environment.

What is true in these two cities is undoubtedly characteristic to a significant degree of most of our communities. Better housing creates problems as well as opportunities, problems that our social and educational institutions must be ready to meet in the urban community of today.

Standard educational patterns are not suited for this type of service. Educational methods designed to serve the middle class, backed by stable family life and established community institutions and standards, will not meet the needs of the culturally deprived and the socially separated. We need education to serve the most elementary requirements of parents as well as children. We need education not only for the eager and the bright, but also for the slow and the reluctant. We need education that will have meaning and reality to people whose community horizon has been limited to the slums, and who have grown accustomed to qualify for relief because they have been unable to qualify for jobs.

The U. S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, in a recent address, stated that problem sharply when he said:

"We need to recognize that the substandard schools of our slums are precisely the wrong schools for the children of poverty. These children need the most skilled of teachers, not the least skilled; the least crowded of classrooms, not the most crowded; the best of educational opportunity, not the least of educational opportunity . . . We must bring the school into the community's life and the community into the school."

Through our housing and urban improvement programs, we are attempting to create the kind of environment, the neighborhoods and the homes, in which that can better be done, in which the desire for self-betterment can grow and in which the educational forces of the community can operate. In short, where our job leaves off, your job begins.

I need not tell this conference of Christian educators that we must concentrate more of our educational resources on the needs of the deprived and the

poor as a matter of both moral and social necessity. More of our educational effort must be directed not to the avenues of learning, but to the backstreets of neglect for the millions of the untrained, the unlettered, and the unschooled. We cannot redeem our communities from the slums unless we redeem the people as well.

• PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS

General Meetings: Minutes

Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 31-April 3, 1964

THE SIXTY-FIRST annual convention of the National Catholic Educational Association was held in Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 31 through April 3, 1964, with the largest registration in NCEA history—more than 17,500 delegates. The 1964 convention was under the patronage of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Archbishop Celestine J. Damiano, D.D., Bishop of Camden, New Jersey. The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Charles P. McGarry of Camden served as General Chairman of the Atlantic City Convention Committee. Other members of the Executive Committee were: the Rt. Rev. Msgr. James C. Foley, the Very Rev. Msgr. Vincent J. Giammarino, the Very Rev. John McMenamin, O.S.A., and the Rev. Augustine J. Seidenburg, all of Atlantic City; the Rev. James J. Gallagher of Avalon, New Jersey, and the Rev. William J. Mark of Woodbury, New Jersey.

The convention opened on Tuesday, March 31, with a Pontifical Dialogue Low Mass held at 9 A.M. in the ballroom of Convention Hall. The formal opening of exhibits took place at 10:15 A.M. on the main floor of Convention Hall. Meetings of departments and sections began at 2 P.M. on March 31 and continued in morning and afternoon sessions on April 1, 2, and 3.

The opening general meeting was held at 11 A.M., Tuesday, March 31, in the ballroom, Convention Hall; a second general meeting was held at 9 A.M. Wednesday, April 1, and the final general session was held at 9 A.M. Friday, April 3.

Associations holding meetings in conjunction with the NCEA were: Augustinian Education Association, Catholic Audio-Visual Educators Association, Catholic Business Education Association, Delta Epsilon Sigma, Kappa Gamma Pi, National Catholic Kindergarten Association, and Saint Dominic Savio Classroom Club.

PONTIFICAL DIALOGUE LOW MASS

A Pontifical Dialogue Low Mass was celebrated for the delegates by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Archbishop Celestine J. Damiano, D.D., Bishop of Camden, New Jersey, in the ballroom of Convention Hall at 9 A.M. Tuesday,

March 31. His Excellency preached the sermon which followed the Mass (reprinted in this volume, pages 21, 22).

OPENING GENERAL MEETING

His Excellency, the Most Reverend John P. Cody, D.D., Apostolic Administrator, New Orleans, and President General of the National Catholic Educational Association, presided at the opening general session held at 11 o'clock, Tuesday morning, March 31, in the ballroom of Convention Hall. The meeting was called to order by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, Executive Secretary of the NCEA, who said the opening prayer. In his words of greeting, Archbishop Damiano paid special tribute to the sisters of the United States for their superior educational attainments as well as their religious dedication.

Monsignor Hochwalt read the following message received from His Holiness Pope Paul VI, transmitted and signed by His Eminence A. J. Cardinal Cicognani:

DAL VATICANO, March 11, 1964

Segreteria Di Stato
Di Sua Santita

Right Reverend and dear Monsignor

The Holy Father has learned with much pleasure of the forthcoming sixty-first anniversary meeting in Atlantic City, New Jersey, of the National Catholic Educational Association, and He has graciously entrusted to me the honoured duty of forwarding to you His cordial good wishes and felicitations.

His Holiness follows with deep interest the dedicated efforts of those engaged in the noble work of Catholic education, and He is not unmindful of the numerous benefits which accrue to a nation and a society from the teaching of the perennially valid principles of Christianity. The Catholic Church, through the centuries, has endeavored to diffuse the light of education in order that ignorance, poverty, disease and the many other ills of our wounded human nature might be conquered, because in Her wisdom She knows that men who are relieved of the anxieties afflicting the body and the mind can devote themselves the more to the all important duty of caring for their souls.

The Pontiff trusts that the discussions and deliberations of your meeting this year may bear much fruit, and while promising you His prayers, He willingly imparts, in pledge of abiding divine assistance, to His Excellency, Archbishop Celestine Damiano under whose generous patronage this gathering is being held, to you, Monsignor Hochwalt, to the members of the National Catholic Educational Association, and to all attending the sixty-first anniversary meeting, His paternal Apostolic Benediction.

With sentiments of esteem and cordial regard, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ,

A. J. Cardinal Cicognani

Right Reverend Monsignor
FREDERICK G. HOCHWALT
Executive Secretary
National Catholic Educational Association
Washington 6, D.C.

Archbishop Cody then read the following message from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE

March 18, 1964

The National Catholic Educational Association has selected a most timely and appropriate theme for its 61st annual meeting. For today, more than ever before in our Nation's history, we turn hopefully to all of our educators, working harmoniously, to assist in resolving some of our most pressing national needs.

We are faced today with a modern counterpart of the biblical Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. But the plagues of our contemporary society—ignorance, disease, poverty and unemployment—can be made to yield like those of centuries ago if we apply our knowledge of science and the arts with determination and persistence. This is the major challenge of our day. It will require the best of our joint efforts.

I am pleased, therefore, to send my greetings to all the Catholic educators assembled in Atlantic City and to urge them to renew their spirit of dedication to this noblest of causes.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson

The Most Reverend John P. Cody
President General
National Catholic Educational Association
Washington, D.C.

Monsignor Hochwalt presented the keynote speaker for this opening session, His Excellency, the Most Reverend John J. Dougherty, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop, Newark, New Jersey, and president of Seton Hall University, who spoke on the theme of the convention, "Catholic Education and National Needs." At the conclusion of the address, Monsignor Hochwalt thanked Bishop Dougherty for a "magnificent and moving speech" (see pages 23-28 of this volume).

The chairman then announced the membership of the Nominations Committee, as follows: Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas W. Lyons, Assistant Director of Education, Washington, D.C., Chairman; Sister Jerome Keeler, O.S.B., Dean, Donnelly College, Kansas City, Kansas; Brother Louis Faerber, S.M., Dean, School of Education, University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio.

The session ended at noon with a closing prayer by Archbishop Cody.

FORMAL OPENING OF EXHIBITS

The ceremony opening the exhibits at 10:15 A.M., Tuesday, March 31, took place on the Musicians Balcony overlooking the main exhibit hall, and began with the singing of the *Star Spangled Banner* by Miss Elsie Mecaskie, accompanied by Miss Lois Miller on the organ. Mr. Joseph O'Donnell, NCEA exhibit manager, as chairman introduced Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, who expressed his thanks to the exhibitors for making this the largest exhibit in the history of the NCEA, and urged the delegates and visitors to see the superb array of educational materials displayed for them.

The chairman then presented His Excellency, the Most Reverend John P. Cody, D.D., Apostolic Administrator, New Orleans, and President General of the National Catholic Educational Association. Archbishop Cody presented 25-year commemorative plaques to the following six exhibitors: D. C. Heath & Company; Field Enterprises Educational Corporation; Silver Burdette Company; American Seating Company; Holt, Rinehart & Winston; and Royal McBee Corporation.

Mr. Edward J. Gavin, Vice President, Noble & Noble Publishers, Inc., and President, National Catholic Educational Exhibitors, concluded the ceremony with greetings from the more than five hundred exhibitors as "proud participants" in the convention.

SECOND GENERAL MEETING

The second general meeting was called to order at 9 A.M., Wednesday, April 1, by Monsignor Hochwalt as chairman. In introducing the speaker, John W. McDevitt, Supreme Knight of the Knights of Columbus, his notable career as teacher, principal, and superintendent of schools, and his service with many educational and community groups was reviewed. Expressing warm appreciation of both Mr. McDevitt's and the Knights of Columbus' staunch friendship for the NCEA, Monsignor Hochwalt announced the gift of \$70,000 from the Knights of Columbus for the printing of a booklet on Catholic education to be distributed at the NCEA exhibit at the New York World's Fair. Mr. McDevitt spoke on "The Layman and the Schools" (see pages 29-36 of this volume).

FINAL GENERAL MEETING

The final general session was held in the ballroom, Convention Hall, at 9 A.M., Friday, April 3. The opening prayer was said by Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas W. Lyons, Assistant Director of Education of the Archdiocese of Washington. Monsignor Hochwalt, chairman, then introduced the speaker, Mr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., who stressed the critical need of better education for the underprivileged, reminding the delegates that the greatest of all causes of poverty is lack of education. (For Mr. Weaver's address, see pp. 37-42 of this volume.)

Business Meeting

The chairman, the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, called upon the Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas W. Lyons, Chairman of the Nominations Committee, to present the nominations for 1964-65. The nominations were:

President General: The Most Reverend John P. Cody, Apostolic Administrator, New Orleans, Louisiana

Vice Presidents General:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frank M. Schneider, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Very Rev. Msgr. Edmond A. Fournier, Bloomfield, Michigan

Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Carl J. Ryan, Cincinnati, Ohio
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edmund J. Goebel, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul E. Campbell, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Sylvester J. Holbel, Orchard Park, New York

The slate was adopted unanimously.

Monsignor Lyons' announcement that the General Executive Board of the Association had unanimously reelected Monsignor Hochwalt to another three-year term as Executive Secretary of the Association was greeted with applause.

Monsignor Hochwalt expressed to the delegates on behalf of Archbishop Cody His Excellency's regret that he had had to miss the closing general session in order to attend the Bishops' meeting in Washington, D.C., and in the name of the Archbishop and on behalf of all the delegates present, extended warmest thanks and appreciation to His Excellency Archbishop Damiano, to Monsignor McGarry, and to all the members of the Atlantic City Convention Committee for their superb hospitality.

Monsignor Hochwalt then introduced Rt. Rev. Msgr. John Paul Haverty, Superintendent of Schools of the Archdiocese of New York, who extended to the Association the warm invitation of His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, to hold its 62nd annual convention in New York City, April 19-22, 1965.

The session then closed with prayer led by Monsignor Lyons.

FREDERICK G. HOCHWALT
Executive Secretary

The Contribution the Behavioral Sciences Can Make in Seminary Training

REV. ANDREW M. GREELEY

*National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago;
Curate, Christ the King Church, Chicago*

IT IS MY PURPOSE this afternoon to suggest the place that social science in general and sociology in particular ought to have in the formation of the young priest. I shall argue that sociology is a liberal discipline in the classical sense of the word, that the "sociological habit of mind" (to paraphrase Cardinal Newman) or the "sociological imagination" (in the words of C. Wright Mills) is essential for the educated man of our society; and that sociology, even in the most unlikely event that it had no practical value whatever in the work of the priest, is of sufficient value in itself for the training and refining of the human personality that it must be part of the education of any person—priest or layman.

I consider the sociological approach to be an orientation of the intellect which is concerned with the study of human relationships, of group-based patterns of behavior, of functional interconnections among social and cultural phenomena, and a holistic conception of social order; in words more simple, it is an orientation which never allows itself to forget the social part of the definition of man as a social animal. I would describe the sociological imagination as an "awareness of the patterning of behavior and belief on the basis of group affiliations, a sensitivity toward and curiosity about the structural dimensions of social life, an interest in the 'inner workings' of society, and an awareness of the important role of painstaking research in obtaining reliable information concerning the social order." In other words, it is a habit of mind which is constantly aware that in almost all human activity man is operating, whether he likes it or not, as a member of a group.

It is my contention that the development of this attitude has always been part of the goal of liberal education and that the study of sociology is simply a more efficient tool, a more direct way of achieving this goal, than the other liberal disciplines which are more adept at producing other goals of liberal education. I would argue that the truly free man is both free from the prejudices of his own tribe and able to understand the modes of thinking of other tribes. Even though he need not relinquish the values of his own tribe and may not approve the values of the other tribes, he, at least, is able to perceive that his own values are not the only ones possible in the world and that the values of members of other tribes are not the result of insincerity or malice but are quite consistent with general social and cultural systems of such tribes.

I am not arguing that the sociologically trained thinker is to become a cultural relativist—though, unfortunately, it seemed at least at one time that many social scientists had become cultural relativists. To recognize the consistency and dignity of another man's values is not at all to say that they are as good as, or even better than, your own, but it is to recognize that those who hold them are not necessarily "infidel dogs." The man with the sociological imagination will not argue that the Chinese convert must become for all practical purposes a European (which in many instances was to say "French") Catholic; that the Slavic tribes ought to become cultivated users of the Roman liturgy; that he as a Southern white understands "his Nigra"; that American Catholics should have the same attitude on Church and state as Italian curialists; or that a Pole ought to adopt the political style of an Irishman. Or, as Robert Redfield has put it, "We do not expect the preliterate person to cultivate and protect individual freedom of thought as we expect civilized people to do. We do not blame the Veddah for failing to have a subtle graphic art. We understand how it is that the Sirono husband leaves his wife to die alone in the jungle and we do not condemn him as we condemn the suburban husband who leaves his wife to die in a snowdrift. We do not expect a people to have a moral norm that their material conditions of life make impossible." On the other hand, as Redfield observes, we are pleased when the preliterate person makes progress; we will be very happy, for example, if the Sirono finally learns that it is better to rescue his wife from the jungle; but we realize that major economic and social changes will have to occur first. We also perceive that while the suburban husband may not leave his wife to die in the snowdrift he is sometimes almost as indifferent to her needs and problems as is the Sirono.

It may seem obvious enough that the ability to tolerate cultural differences is necessary for the educated man. Let it be observed, however, that this ability has never existed in abundance in human society and that a good number of bloody wars have been fought on the opposite premise that that which is different is evil and must be extirpated. Furthermore, there have been many violent misunderstandings short of war as a result of the somewhat less inflammatory principle that that which is different is dangerous—or, at least, extremely funny.

It ought to be perfectly clear to the average man that, in the course of his life, he will encounter all kinds of people who come from different social backgrounds and, hence, have different value patterns than he does. If he is a white Catholic Irish-American male, he will have to deal with Negroes, with Protestants, with Jews, with women, with Poles, with his parents, with his children, with his boss, with his subordinates, with his clients, with clergy (or laity), and with a vast variety of other people who are apparently not intelligent enough to see things his way. He is, therefore, immediately tempted to write these people off as stupid, blind, malicious, insincere, illogical, and out to torment him. If he were a primitive he would also suspect them of being in the pay of evil spirits. If he is liberally educated, however, he controls his tongue and his temper because he has come to understand that these people are different from him because to varying extents they are products of different social systems or subsystems with at least slightly different value patterns and norm expectations. Let it be observed that this is not easy.

It is my contention that a study of how society conditions (but not necessarily determines) human attitudes, values, and behaviour will lead to both greater self-knowledge and more tolerance for the variety of the human

phenomenon. An understanding of the socialization process, of racial and ethnic differences, cultural variations and similarities, the discrepancy between behaviour and norms, and the nature and operation of social change ought to produce a student with more intellectual patience, warmer human sympathy, deeper insights into human suffering, greater flexibility of opinion, more moderate reforming instincts, and more perceptive critical acumen. I take it that these goals are desirable for all Christians, lay and clerical alike. Admittedly, social science courses do not always produce the desired effect; but neither, it must be conceded, do many of the other courses to which the American collegian is subjected.

I wish now to turn from a general consideration of sociology as a liberal discipline to the more specific subject of sociology in the training of the cleric, since, while the sociological imagination is useful to all young people, it has special utility for the future cleric. As a beginning of this topic I would like to refer to a phenomenon which seems to occur at the class reunions of the younger clergy in the large metropolitan dioceses. The young priests who have been assigned to the very poor parishes in the inner city tend to dominate these sessions with hilarious stories about the peculiar mores and morals of the Negro, the Spanish-speaking, and the poor white people in their parishes. There can be no doubt that by middle-class standards the moral practices of many of these people are, to say the least, a little unusual. But I for one fail to find the subject particularly funny and I would suspect that clerics trained in some kind of understanding of lower-class culture would not be amused either. To my mind, joking about the moral plight of those in a culture of poverty is akin to doctors joking about the illness of their patient; it is in poor taste and just a little gruesome.

Only slightly different, it seems to me, is the dogmatic paternalism which some clerics who have worked for many years in inner city parishes seem to display. They have all the answers to the problems of *their* people and know exactly what *their* people need and want and what must be done for them. The white man's burden continues to be heavy. Both the paternalistic pastor and the amused curate are ethnocentric. They don't really understand what is going on inside a social system that is different from their own. Their expertise may qualify them to be cousins of Kipling's *Soldiers Three*, but they are as unprepared to deal with change in the inner city culture as were Kipling's successors to deal with the New India. They don't really respect their people. I cannot argue that sociology will teach them respect, but if they could view the life of the inner city as a social structure, as a whole style of life as highly organized as their own, then they might be able to substitute sympathy and insight for funny stories and cliché answers.

In addition to helping the future priest to understand people different from himself, sociology also equips him with the thought categories necessary to analyze in precise terms the social problems he must face in his work. With the help of concepts like that of social class, for example, he is able to size up the situation in his parish without groping around for years trying to figure out what is happening in the parish and not being able to define why it is different from the one in which he grew up, or why the activities which were among his pet interests in the seminary won't work in the parish to which he has been assigned. Sociological training helps a young man to realize that what works in one parish will not work in another, and what was a favorite activity in one is a waste of time in another. Thus, even though he may have run the best young people's club in the city in one

parish, he must not conclude that the young people in another parish are impossible because they seem uninterested in such a program. (But they might be very interested in YCW if he were flexible enough to give it a try.)

Sociology ought further to help a young man develop a healthy skepticism about panaceas and party lines. He comes to realize that reality is so variegated that there are no simple answers or even simple problems, and that the one who claims to have the magic answer—whether it be the Sorrowful Mother Novena or the Cursillo or anything else—simply does not know what he is talking about. A realization of the complexity of human relationships, of course, does not mean that a young priest is indifferent to the various movements at work in the Church or that he is unwilling to make the most out of the wisdom these movements offer. But he also realizes that a party line substitutes jargon for thought, and that no national organization can provide a solution for the problems with which he must work; at best it can be a stimulus to his thought. But for his own thought there is no substitute.

Because sociology is an empirical science—one that displays a passion for the collection of facts—the future priest who is exposed to its methodology may develop a skepticism for generalizations which cannot be supported by evidence. Sociology, since it is by its very nature oriented toward the debunking of the Conventional Wisdom, may inhibit the clerical tendency to transfer the certainty we have in matters of faith to every other form of human knowledge—from pro-football to politics. The temptation for the clergyman to become an intolerant old bachelor is a strong one; and, while sociology can hardly claim to substitute for a wife and family in the teaching of patience and sympathy, it can at least knock some of the intellectual props out from under our intolerance.

Sociology, since it thinks in terms of human organization, ought to help the priest to realize what it means to say that the Church is an organization. While it will hardly lead to an end of criticism of pastors by their curates (and vice versa), it will at least lead to awareness that very often the problem between these groups has nothing to do with malice but, rather, with differential positions in the social structure and the collapse of communication between the positions. The complaining curate will come to realize that on the happy day he becomes a pastor he will almost automatically begin to do things which will lead *his* curates to complain about him. The sociological imagination understands that in the absence of structural change a curate will continue to be a mouse in training to be a rat. Indeed, organizational theory is extremely important if the Church is going to be understood by its members. Here the work of my colleague, Morris Janowitz, on fraternal authority in the military establishment would be of great help to the young priest (and the old priest, too). The problem of fraternalization of authority, of upward communication, of information collection must be understood by all the skilled professionals whose involvement is necessary for the work of the Church to go on. Perhaps the greatest contribution sociology can make to the Church today is to help us to understand what it means to be a large, complex, and bureaucratized organization. Without this understanding we are going to have much frustration, friction, and, I fear, conflict.

I should think that the sociological concept of role would be of considerable use to the young cleric whose role is so clearly changing. If he learns to think with this category, he will understand the differences between the essentials of the priestly function and those accidentals which are undergoing change and will continue to do so. He will not be upset because he does not play

the role that his idolized young priest did when he was in grammar school. He will understand that the role expectations of his people are very different from those of an older generation and that while they expect some things from him that were not expected in the past, there are also many things which he cannot get away with that his predecessors could. He will also come to realize, I think, that the role of the priest has gained stature in recent years, even though many of the prerogatives of bygone years have been shed. He will further begin to appreciate that there are other roles in the Church, too, and that the occupants of these roles view the reality of the Church from the perspective proper to *their* role and not from *his* perspective. Thus, he will come to understand that the laity and the nuns, for example, see things differently than he. He will further understand that as the roles of these other groups change, the whole network of relations with them in which he is involved must change, too.

This brings me to the last contribution of sociology to the formation of the priest, one which for the priest personally may be the most important. It ought to help him to understand social change. There are two things which are obvious about social change and yet which must be said constantly because they are so often ignored in practice: It is inevitable and it is slow. The older cleric must recognize the inevitability of change. It will do him no good to bemoan that the younger clergy are different, or that the laity are different; of course, they are different, they have grown up in different worlds, they are products of different cultural and social systems. As the world changes so the Church must change, too—not in essentials, but the man with the sociological imagination is less likely to confuse his own prejudices, or “The way things always have been done,” or the comfortable habits of a lifetime with the essence of the Church. Catholic action, liturgy, the New Scripture studies may be disconcerting to the veteran, but if he understands social change, he is, at least, not so likely to condemn these things as the work of the devil—and then look very foolish when it turns out that the Church has embraced these innovations and he must, too.

For the young priest it is more important to realize that social change comes slowly—often inch by inch. I remember the first time I felt I was old; it was when I had a violent argument with a seminarian about the effectiveness of Catholic Action and liturgy on “reviving” parochial life. The young man was quite convinced that the major problems of the apostolate had to do with techniques, and that a modification of techniques would lead to the emergence of a “living parish.” I assured him that if he had a free hand in a parish and could introduce all the innovations in Catholic Action and liturgy that he wanted, the results would at the most affect 5 percent of the people of the parish—and not all of them favorably. I further pointed out that in the present state of Christianity the “living parish” existed in the books of Abbé Micheneau and in the minds of some American lay intellectuals but not in reality. I trust my record is clear enough that I will not be accused of being opposed to change. However, it is an empty illusion to think that change occurs at once or without suffering, difficulty, conflict, frustration, and frequent failures. Sociology will not eliminate discouragement or failure; it will not even make it less painful. But it ought to help the young priest to understand that one battle—won or lost—is not a campaign, much less a war. It is not the dreamer who plans to change the world the day after tomorrow that keeps working in the face of frustration and defeat; it is rather the realist, who has no illusions about how much he is going

to accomplish, that does not give up when the going becomes rough. If sociology teaches us nothing else, it is that change cannot be stopped, but that it can only be accelerated by the most determined kind of efforts; and even then, the acceleration will be rather slow.

These, then, are some of the ways in which sociology can help in the formation of the priest. I am under no illusion that the sociological imagination can be formed in two semesters of class. All I could expect is that an exposure to the methods and categories of sociology will open to the minds of seminarians the possibilities of growth inherent in the further study of human society. But, then, this is about all any course can do, no matter what the subject.

I see no point in any more than two semesters of required sociology. We must resist the temptation of seminaries to multiply courses to meet every fad and fashion that comes along. Any educated man in our society must have at least three years of social science training in his college curriculum; the seminarian ought to be no exception. A year of economics, a year of psychology, and a year of sociology are essential if he is going to be in a position of equality with his sisters and brothers and cousins in other colleges. And let these courses be truly "social science." Let us not confuse a course in the teachings of the encyclicals with economics, or a course in rational psychology with one in experimental psychology, or a course in social ethnics or social problems with one in sociology. I am not opposed to ethics or papal teaching or philosophical psychology; however, I am simply affirming that they are not social science.

It seems altogether reasonable to assume that during the years of theology there could be seminars on "pastoral sociology" though I don't think we know yet what this means. I would presume, however, that it might mean training in elementary research techniques which would enable a priest to analyze the specific social problems he is likely to face in his work. I would also suspect that it would be a very good thing for some of the seminarians of a diocese to be permitted to pursue advanced studies in social science leading to a master's or even a doctorate, both because a diocese clearly needs experts in some of these fields (population, ecology, counseling, et cetera) but also because it is a very good thing for the Church to have some of its clergy represented in these fields of secular learning (and please spare me the arguments about these disciplines being the preserve of the laity. I presume there is room for the Church to be represented in the social sciences by both kinds of representatives and that the tradition of clerical involvement in secular learning is old enough in the Church not to be questioned save by the most fanatical of laicists).

It goes without saying that the men who teach these subjects in seminaries should be at least as well trained as those who teach them in the colleges. Thus, the social science professor should have a Ph.D. in his field and from as good a university as possible. These subjects cannot be taught by a philosophy professor or a moral theologian who has a part-time interest in sociology or psychology. I might add that there is no reason, to my mind, why a layman could not teach these subjects in the seminary either (though there is no reason why he must be the teacher).

Finally, a word ought to be said about the content of such courses. At least in sociology let it be said of the textbook *ne nominetur inter vos*. I remember in my first course at the University of Chicago, Everett Hughes, one of America's greatest sociologists, asked on the first day of class how many of us had ever read a sociology text. When about two-thirds of

the class put up their hands, Dr. Hughes looked intensely pained. "Well," he said, "I don't suppose it will do you any harm, but please promise me never to do it again." In sociology at least there is not yet anything near an organized body of knowledge which can be presented in a textbook. Sociology currently is an approach, a mode of analysis, more than a series of logically connected propositions. One comes to understand this approach only by reading the work of men who are actually using it. I would argue that a seminary course in sociology ought to be essentially a series of guided readings in the best, the most interesting, the most fascinating books of actual sociological research. Instead of memorizing definitions, the student should come into contact with work which either because of its subject matter, or its skill, will arouse his interest in further sociological reading. Thus, he should read Warner on social class and ethnicity, White on street corner society, Homans on social behavior and the human group, Lipset on social class and union democracy, Rossi on urban renewal, Hunter on community power structure, Cohen on delinquency, Lenski on religion, Durkheim on suicide, Janowitz on the military, Mills on the power elite, Hughes on French Canada, Frazier on the Negro middle class, Blau on bureaucracy, Hauser on population, Goffman on the presentation of self, Gans and Moynihan and Glazer on the survival of ethnic groups, and Fichter on the parish. Most of these books are available in paperback and the Bobbs-Merrill reprint series provides a treasure trove of articles to add to the course. But please spare us *The Organization Man* and *The Hidden Persuaders*; they are interesting enough in their own way but they are not sociology.

The program I have described does not present an integrated course, but, then, there doesn't seem to be much point in trying to have an integrated course in a field where there is little in the way of integration yet (or likely to be in the foreseeable future). My own hunch is that if sociology is disorganized, it is at least still exciting, and that a course which takes out the disorganization also takes out the excitement.

Perhaps, in one of these sociology courses I have been describing there will in the near future sit the young man for whom we are all waiting, that future theologian who will perceive that we can come to understand the theology of the Church the way we ought only when we understand what it means to say the Church is a society. It is my suspicion that this theologian of the future who will be able to bring about a marriage between sociology and theology—to the mutual advantage of both fields—may be one of the most important men in the history of Christendom.

Modern Science and the Relevance of Scholastic Philosophy

VERY REV. BENEDICT W. ASHLEY, O.P.

*President, Aquinas Institute of Philosophy and Theology,
School of Philosophy, River Forest, Illinois*

IN THE LIGHT of the great movement to bring the Gospel to our contemporary world, which has crystallized in the Second Council of the Vatican, we are all concerned about the seminary curriculum which ought to be one of the chief sources of this renewal.

Why is it that this great movement is so necessary today in the Church? Why is it that our Catholic culture, and the type of traditional thought so well represented in the standard seminary courses, has so lost touch with the modern world? What happened to produce this tragic division which now requires such heroic efforts to overcome? Obviously, no remedy can be found until we know the cause of the disease.

No doubt the disease is complex, and is not the result of any one single cause. Many, however, would say that the principal factor is the failure of Christians to meet the social problems of our time, those problems so well enumerated in *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in Terris*. Yet, what is at the roots of these social problems? Is it not the enormous change in man's knowledge and control of nature produced by the rise of the modern scientific method? Is anything more obvious than that the problem of *aggiornamento* is fundamentally the problem of the Church learning to live in a world produced by modern science?

Pope Pius XII saw this with prophetic clearness. Unfortunately, as far as I know, the Council has not yet emphasized this fundamental fact. Perhaps it will come to the fore in the discussion of the final schema on the place of the Church on the modern world. The rumored encyclical on Galileo may afford Pope Paul the opportunity to emphasize the same question.

No doubt one of the main reasons for the strength of atheistic communism in the underdeveloped countries of the world, and of atheistic secularism in the advanced countries, is precisely because in these ideologies the importance of science is fully recognized. On the other hand, the weakness of all the great religions of the world in the face of these movements is precisely their failure to give to science a really significant and meaningful role.

In honesty, is this not also true of our seminaries? Until comparatively recently the natural sciences and their related mathematical tools played only a minimum role in our curricula. Today, with the spread of the 4-4-4 system and with the common practice of giving an accredited B.A. degree before entrance into the school of theology, it has become usual to require a course or two of college science with laboratory work. This certainly has been a step in the right direction, but it is wholly superficial. Of what vital importance is it for a priest to have a brief introduction to science, unless in his subsequent

lengthy study of philosophy and theology what he has learned in science plays a real part in his philosophical and theological picture of the universe and life?

What have we been doing to bring the scientific world picture into a living synthesis with the philosophical and theological world picture? The surprising vogue which the thought of Teilhard de Chardin has had among seminarians throughout the world (a popularity which led to official disapproval from the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries) is a striking symptom of a deeply felt need. Father Teilhard presented a synthesis of science, philosophy, and theology, a synthesis which is by no means wholly successful, but, nevertheless, a synthesis to which young men deeply Christian and yet modern were looking forward, a synthesis which is not provided in the standard curriculum.

Not only is there no synthesis between science and philosophy and theology, but there is an actual opposition. At one time this opposition was one of antagonism. Our philosophers and theologians actually opposed as false the world picture presented by scientists, especially evolution, and brought forward a whole futile array of apologetic weapons against it. Fortunately, that battle is now counted as lost, but what has replaced it is something perhaps even more dangerous. The present opposition is not that of antagonism, but of *irrelevance*.

Today, in seminaries as in our colleges, it is common to begin philosophy courses by a series of careful explanations of the "distinction between philosophy and science." The outcome of this distinction is to show that philosophy is wholly independent of any shifts or advances in science, that it has a method of its own entirely free from experimentation or measurement, that it arrives at certain knowledge of being. On the other hand, science is pictured as a study which is constantly shifting and changing, which is wholly dependent on experimentation and measurement, which never attains to more than probability, and which remains purely on the level of phenomena which it orders by hypothetical constructs. Science never attains to the essences or natures of things, skirts being but never attains it, and cannot deal with the existential order of things. Science, therefore, is valuable for technological and practical reasons but cannot really increase our intellectual insight into the world.

This is seen in gross form in the fact that in educational circles it is taken as obvious that the humanities do not include science, while for the ancients the study of nature was par excellence a humane discipline.

This low epistemological rating of scientific knowledge serves the function of an apology for the study of philosophy, whose value may not be very evident to the seminarian. Its results are curious.

First, it results in a quite uncritical attitude to science itself. Since science has been shown to move on an entirely different level than philosophy, it appears that its results are entirely irrelevant to philosophical principles. The old theory of the two truths appears again. There is no need to harmonize the findings of science with philosophical principles, and so they are accepted at face value. The student is told that as a scientist he may accept a mechanistic picture of the world, although this is shown in philosophy to be erroneous.

Secondly, it results in a total disinterest in science on the part even of some intelligent students.

Thirdly, it is more and more resulting in a feeling among students that scholastic philosophy and especially Thomism is *irrelevant*. No one attempts to refute Thomism; they simply set it aside as wholly disconnected with the concerns of the modern world.

Finally, this has led to a search for another philosophical approach to replace Thomism. This is the significance of the interest in Chardin, but Chardin does not provide a sufficiently elaborated philosophy. To go back to Bergson, with whom Chardin's thought originated, seems not very promising. As a result, the main stream of Catholic philosophy has turned toward Hegel, on the one hand, and existentialism on the other.

What is significant is that Hegelianism, existentialism, and phenomenology at present do not seem willing to face the basic difficulties caused by modern science. Although Hegel himself and Husserl and Jaspers were all very acutely aware of this problem and attempted to meet it, they did so without much success. More typical is the view of Sartre, for whom the world of science is the world of absurdity; that is, a world without human significance. We find Catholic philosophy strongly tempted to retreat into this world of subjectivity and of interpersonal relations, leaving the whole external world of nature to science.

This flight from science has deep roots in the past; it is connected with the injurious effect which Platonism had on the whole Middle Ages. It was precisely against this that St. Thomas Aquinas revolted, and it is one of the chief reasons why the popes have favored Thomism as a basic philosophy: namely, that Thomism insists on the fundamental importance for philosophy and theology of the scientific investigation of nature in all its details. It is this aspect of Thomism which so few modern Thomists have understood or exploited. Until we begin to do so, there is not much hope that we will find a real way to heal the gap between Catholic thought and the modern world view; it is certainly not to be found in a revival of idealism, even its existentialist or phenomenalist forms.

If the foregoing argument is sound we must conclude that the education of priests ought to provide a study of the scientific world picture not merely as a part of general culture, but as the *foundation* of their study of philosophy, and hence of their study of theology.

In our present seminary programs there are two tendencies. One is to found all study in scholastic logic. Those who attack seminary "scholasticism" usually are really complaining against the tendency to make of logic an ontological mold in which all reality must be fitted. St. Thomas, on the other hand, was most careful to reduce logic to a pure tool of thought by which the mind was made flexible and docile to reality.

The second tendency is to make the basic study metaphysics—a view diametrically opposed to the whole structure of St. Thomas' philosophy, although it so often passes for "authentic Thomism." By this maneuver, the whole world of nature with which science is concerned is bypassed in one great intuitive leap.

For St. Thomas, on the other hand, sound philosophy begins very humbly with the world of experience, the same world with which science deals, and makes no pretense to transcend that world except through cautious study of nature itself. It differs from science only in that it subjects the theories proposed by science to a searching criticism in an effort to distinguish between the solid structure already erected and the scaffolding of hypotheses needed in further construction.

Thus, our philosophy ought to be built up with all available materials including the most recent advances of science, yet it is not for this reason a shifting or uncertain knowledge since it rests on critically established ground.

A philosophy grounded in this way will be relevant to contemporary society in its own right, but it will also be a most valuable aid to the formation of a

living theology. For example, the theological treatise on God and creatures today might be taught with the help of a philosophical world-picture which is genuinely evolutionary in character, and the treatise on human acts must be taught with the help of a philosophy of man that embraces all that we have discovered experimentally and clinically about human learning and motivation.

What should this mean in practice?

1. If we have control over the minor seminary program we should see that this includes the following elements: (a) Training in logic through the English and mathematics courses. Without the ability to form and define abstract concepts and to reason correctly, science is closed to the learner. This ability is not achieved through a short course in formal logic, but must be attained by lengthy practice. (b) Adequate courses in mathematics taught by the modern methods which emphasize axiomatic reasoning. Without some mathematical proficiency there can be no advance in science. (c) Acquaintance with the principal facts of science and with laboratory methods through courses in biology, chemistry, and physics.

When we accept students with inferior high school backgrounds into the major seminary, it is essential that we plan for some kind of remedial study which will in part repair the lack of the elements just listed. Probably the best remedy would be a course in laboratory science in which the logic of science is stressed.

2. In the first two years of college there should be a sequence of courses designed to give the student an understanding of the scientific world-picture. For those who think that the methods of science and the method of the philosophy of nature are radically different, such a sequence would have to consist of three or four courses covering the fields of physical science, biology, and psychology, followed by a course in the philosophy of nature which would attempt to criticize what has been learned about the scientific world-picture and to show its philosophical significance. Needless to say, the person teaching this last course would have to be thoroughly acquainted with the science courses already taken by the student and able to criticize their contents fairly and with scientific competence.

For those who believe in the essential continuity of the philosophy and the science of nature, as I do, a much more compact program consisting of four semester courses would recommend itself. The first would be devoted to the basic facts of the scientific world-picture as it is today. The second would be a philosophical criticism of these facts so as to establish fundamental principles concerning matter and form, causality, change, et cetera. The third would go on to the living world of biology, and the fourth to psychology, in each case presenting the modern picture and giving it a philosophical analysis and criticism. These same four courses could also be presented in a more historical fashion, using the first two to show the historical development of the physical sciences, and the second two to show the historical development of the life sciences, but using the historical evolution to illustrate philosophical debate and construction.

If the program of a four-semester sequence in the first two years of college is followed, then the upper two years of college can be devoted to ethics and metaphysics along with more study of the history of philosophy and a greater acquaintance with modern philosophers.

On the other hand, if philosophy can only be given in the last two college years, then I would recommend that two semesters be devoted to the philosophy of nature, and that the first semester give the scientific world-picture and then

philosophically analyze its implications as regards inanimate nature, and that the second semester be devoted to psychology, without neglecting the biological aspects of man.

In any case, I would strongly urge that metaphysics follow on the philosophical study of science and not precede it. If it precedes, I do not know how we can escape giving the student the impression that philosophy is essentially a deductive system known *a priori* to any scientific exploration of the world and rendering it nugatory. It is just this impression which has separated the seminary from the contemporary world.

In teaching a scientific sequence in any of the forms I have just mentioned, it seems important that we make as full use as possible of audio-visual aids, of the laboratory, of the museum, and of nature study. Without these, the course will remain verbal. The study of nature must be rooted in sense experience, and if an insight into nature is to be a personal possession of the student's, this experience must be his and not merely the teacher's.

I hardly need emphasize that all this requires a teacher who is genuinely interested in science and who has solid training in it, at least a master's degree in some branch of laboratory science as well as philosophical competence. We can hardly expect a teacher whose bent is primarily metaphysical, and who has only a remote acquaintance with science, to make courses of the type described anything more than verbal exercises.

An obvious objection which will be raised to what I have just proposed: Where are men with this training to be found? They are not to be found. *We must develop them.* Until we do, our priests are going to enter an apostolate to the contemporary world without any genuine understanding of or sympathy for that world which is the creation of scientific thinking.

The Intellectual Formation of the Future Priest

REV. WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J.

Professor of Patristic Theology, Woodstock College

THE THEME of this paper needs no opening plea. It is highly important, because it concerns intimately the future of the American Church. As Father Stafford Poole put it recently: "The history of the Catholic Church in the United States may well be determined by what developments take place in our seminaries during the next generation."¹

To do justice to my subject, I must limit its scope. First, I dare not deal with every seminarian in the universe, with every seedbed for priests, in Angola or Austria or Australia. I shall speak of the United States of America. Second, within the United States I dare not deal with every species of seminary, with, for example, Maryknoll and Gethsemane, with formation for foreign missions or the contemplative life. I shall speak of those seminaries where the accent is on preparation for an active apostolate in this country. Third, within the active apostolate I dare not deal with every form or shape of the ministry: with the dean of men or the cardinal's secretary, with the would-be teacher or the potential scholar, whether scientist or theologian, philosopher or philo-

logian, historian or sociologist, canon lawyer or patrologist. I shall speak of those seminarians whose primary role is destined to be within the parish, in a day-to-day confrontation with the parishioner as a parishioner. Fourth, I dare not deal with every phase of the parish priest's intellectual formation: detailed curriculum, time of class, visual aids. I shall restrict myself to three broad points: (1) the substance of the seminarian's intellectual formation, (2) the atmosphere in which this substance is to subsist, and (3) several long-range suggestions looking to the seminary of the seventies.

I. SUBSTANCE

There is a perennial constant to the priesthood. It is quite clear, I think, from the ritual of ordination and from the documents of the Church that a young man (1) tutored in God's revelation is ordained (2) to offer sacrifice, (3) to dispense sacraments, and (4) to preach the gospel. But this constant is nuanced by a need—a need that is variable, because it stems from new situations and new people. So, then, the answer to the question, "How form tomorrow's priests intellectually?" depends on another question, "What does the Church of today expect of tomorrow's priests?" And by "the Church" I do not mean merely the Pope or the Roman Congregation on Seminaries; I mean the whole People of God. And today's People of God expect of tomorrow's priest of God the four age-old demands in a new context: (1) not a sterile catechism or dead dogma, but theology in tune with the times; (2) not a routine Mass, but a living liturgy; (3) not a confession machine, but pastoral counseling; (4) not pulpit announcements or pious pap, but sermons and homilies woven of divine revelation and human wisdom. Theology, liturgy, counseling, homiletics—such are the four elements I call "substance." Obviously they overlap, but since they are not identical, they can be treated separately for sweet clarity's sake.

Theology

The problem of "theology in seminary confinement" was recently analyzed with uncommon acumen by Charles Davis in the *Downside Review*.² He did not draw up an indictment; he was not concerned with blame; his effort was to uncover the defects of contemporary theology as a guide for the future. With this in mind, he looked to the past. History showed him that theology is greatly influenced by the environment in which it is studied. Theology in the patristic age was predominantly an episcopal theology marked by a strong pastoral concern. In the Early Middle Ages theology became largely a monastic theology, where theology and contemplation walked hand in hand, where theology was more human in its approach, less narrowly cerebral. The theology of High Scholasticism was a university theology, a child of the same intellectual renaissance and social changes that gave birth to the universities themselves. After the Reformation came seminary theology:

. . . I mean a theology that was no longer contemplation as prolonged in a reflective mind, no longer the exciting pursuit of new problems as questions bubbled forth incessantly from the university ferment, but the careful training of priests in Catholic doctrine, particularly as determined by Trent, in order that they might instruct the faithful in such doctrine at a lower level and defend the teaching of the Church against the attacks of heretics. I take the necessity of this for granted in the particular historical circumstances.³

What are the limitations and defects of such a theology? Davis mentions five. (1) It is not a theology of active research and incessant questioning, but a course of conservative instruction in Catholic teaching. (2) It is largely a textbook theology, a gathering and ordering for pedagogical purposes of what others have said; and, like the textbook, it is highly conservative, it lags behind current thinking, it creates a specious consent of theologians by disregarding the living theologian who is actually grappling with the problems. (3) It is a thesis theology, with a polemical origin and basis, with Scripture reduced to proof-texts, with theological discussions hardened too soon in rigid concepts and propositions. (4) It is a Denzinger theology, built around statements of the magisterium, forgetful that even solemn definitions are partial statements in historical contexts, never exhaustive formulations of revealed truth. (5) It is a clerical, Latinized theology: clerical in tone and purpose, because studied almost exclusively by the clergy and subordinated to their outlook and needs; Latin in language and cultural content; even where English is used, the terminology is borrowed, the cast of thought is Latin, and creative thinking is all but impossible.

The remedy? It may well be that no over-all, drastic, thoroughgoing revision is possible in seminary confinement. But this much at least is reasonable and possible:

Seminary theology should have a much more strongly pronounced kerygmatic flavour. By this I mean that it should have a far closer connection with preaching and catechetical teaching. The *kerygma* is the basic Christian message, and theology, wherever pursued, can sever its links with this only at the cost of its own death. But theology in the seminary ought to be more conscious than it need be elsewhere of the task of handing on that message. Homiletics and catechetics are not themselves theology; for they are concerned with the practical task of transmitting the Christian message, while theology is the systematic study of that message, the *science* of the Word, seeking its intelligibility. But since seminarists are to spend their lives as priests in the preaching and teaching of the Word, it seems reasonable to ask that their scientific study of the Word should bear a close relation to their task. This is not to say that they should cease to study theology as a science and be content with a slightly higher form of catechetical training. But seminary theology at the moment is cluttered up with many questions that the seminarists will never have occasion to think of again, while other matters of great pastoral importance are comparatively neglected. But seminary theology can be given this kerygmatic bias only if seminaries cease to treat homiletics and catechetics in the casual fashion that they do and begin to give students some serious training in them. The theology course could then be fitted into the framework of such training and adapted accordingly. It need not cease to be theology by being made pastorally relevant.⁴

Liturgy

A second substantial element in the intellectual formation of tomorrow's priest is the liturgy. This is not an area of dispute, open to free theological discussion. Liturgy is not an elective—not since the Second Vatican Council declared in its *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*:

The study of sacred liturgy is to be ranked among the compulsory and major courses in seminaries and religious houses of study; in theological faculties it is to rank among the principal courses. It is to be taught under its

theological, historical, spiritual, pastoral, and juridical aspects. Moreover, other professors, while striving to expound the mystery of Christ and the history of salvation from the angle proper to each of their own subjects, must nevertheless do so in a way which will clearly bring out the connection between their subjects and the liturgy, as also the unity which underlies all priestly training. This consideration is especially important for professors of dogmatic, spiritual, and pastoral theology and for those of Holy Scripture.⁵

This does not mean more classes in rubrics. It means that today's seminarian must be more deeply grounded in liturgical understanding than any seminarian in the Church's history. For each of the five aspects mentioned in the *Constitution* is an intellectual discipline in itself: the theology of the liturgy; the history of the liturgy; the liturgical orientation of modern spirituality; liturgy and parish life; liturgy and law. These facets of the liturgy are no longer a luxury; this is what the Church demands of her priests. Tomorrow's priest will lead his people to intelligent worship, to intense spirituality, not by external rubrics, not by conformity to regulations, not even by the use of English. He will do so because he is himself an expert in all that makes the liturgy the center of parochial life. He is and will continue to be a hungry student of the liturgy; his own spiritual life will be liturgically focused. He dares not plead that he is a practitioner and not a pedant, that all this is for the ivory tower, for the "liturbugs." This fivefold formation in liturgy is (1) a work of intelligence, (2) a central preoccupation, (3) a study that can never cease. Intellectual, pivotal, unending: it is a task the seminarian can disregard only on penalty of being unfaithful to the vocation of a priest in our time.

Counseling

There is a third demand on tomorrow's priest. The People of God are no longer satisfied—if ever they were—with mechanical confession and an absolution machine. They want, in and out of the box, pastoral counseling: what a Benedictine psychologist has described as "an interpersonal relationship of acceptance, understanding, and communication between a priest (or a clergyman) and a parishioner for the purpose of assisting that person in making choices and decisions, and thus pursue his own Christian vocation according to his capacities with more happiness."⁶ No parish priest can be indifferent to this task; it is part and parcel of his priestly function. Not that he replaces the psychiatrist, the psychotherapist, the professional psychologist; he does not. But he must be a religious counselor, simply because he is responsible for the religious life of his people.

He approaches this pastoral task with unique spiritual resources. As a priest, he is a channel of grace through the action of Christ in the liturgy, a pattern to his flock by his total consecration to Christ. As a theologian, he has a specialized knowledge of things divine, of spiritual values. As a pastor, he has an operational understanding of virtue and sin, an experiential insight into people and problems.⁷

But this is not enough. To use these resources effectively, the priest needs a fund of psychological knowledge—on at least four levels. He must understand the basic factors in mental health; he must be able to recognize the signs of mental illness; he must have some training in the techniques of counseling; and he should be aware of community resources and methods of referral.⁸

Pastoral counseling calls for knowledge, understanding, wisdom, and tech-

nique. It involves the art of establishing rapport, the art of listening, the gift of communicating compassion. It means, above all, a one-to-one relationship: the priest must somehow learn to deal with each person, as Van Zeller puts it, "as if there was no one else in the world, as if there existed no recognized method of treatment in 'such cases,' as if there had never been any similar situation in the history of man, as if textbooks, formulae, and even previous experience were as remote as the Himalayas." ⁹

Such counseling is, in large measure, a matter of intellectual formation. The priest must know something of mental health and much of the human heart. He must know more of human weakness, more of scrupulosity and alcoholism, more of homosexuality and masturbation, than can reach him from the moral-theology textbook. And since issues with psychiatric aspects will present themselves to priests with increasing frequency and cogency, I would subscribe to what Dr. Braceland and Father Stock have recently written:

As a consequence, a clear and sound judgment on psychiatry as a whole seems particularly important for those who deal with men's souls and spirits and should be provided for them during the time when they are forming their basic outlook on things. This means that psychiatry, at least in its general principles and broad outlines, should be introduced into the major seminaries, not to make professional psychiatrists out of the students there, but to give them a deep and solid orientation toward an area of science which will impinge closely on almost all the other areas they will study. ¹⁰

Homiletics

A fourth issue of pastoral substance is homiletics.¹¹ You see, the contemporary Catholic has a twin attitude towards the contemporary pulpit: he is scandalized and/or he is bored. By the "pulpit" I do not mean the special occasion, the novena, the mission; I mean our bread-and-butter preaching, the Sunday-after-Sunday sermon. And by the "Catholic" I do not mean the lax and the liberal, the sophisticate and the dilettant; I mean the average layman, reasonably intelligent, normally charitable, with no ax to grind, content with any edible crumb that falls from the pulpit.

This Catholic is scandalized by the pulpit because what is most characteristic of the Christian message, what is most meaningful in God's self-revelation, is too often not given him. He gets the hour of baptism, but not its symbolism; the sins against marriage, but not St. Paul's "great mystery"; hell, yes, but not heaven; the seductions of the flesh, but not the role of the flesh in man's redemption; the death that is sin, but not the life that is grace; the sacrifice of self and of money, but not the Sacrifice of the Mass. In a word, he is not getting the richness, the vast sweep, of Catholic doctrine, especially in its relevance for the sixties.

And when he is not scandalized, he is bored. Where doctrine is preached—as often it is by episcopal mandate and chancery outline—it is rarely preached effectively. This problem of an ineffective rhetoric is pungently put in Morris West's novel *The Devil's Advocate*. Bishop Aurelio of Valenta, a man of fine insight and understanding, says to "the devil's advocate," Monsignor Blaise Meredith:

. . . We have a language of our own . . . formal, stylized, admirably suited to legal and theological definition. Unfortunately we have also a rhetoric of our own, which, like the rhetoric of the politician, says much and conveys little. But we are not politicians. We are teachers—teachers of a truth which we

claim to be essential to man's salvation. Yet how do we preach it? We talk roundly of faith and hope as if we were making a fetishist's incantation. What is faith? A blind leap into the hands of God. An inspired act of will which is our only answer to the terrible mystery of where we came from and where we are going. What is hope? A child's trust in the hand that will lead it out of the terrors that reach from the dark. We preach love and fidelity, as if these were teacup tales—and not bodies writhing on a bed and hot words in dark places, and souls tormented by loneliness and driven to the momentary communion of a kiss. We preach charity and compassion but rarely say what they mean—hands dabbling in sickroom messes, wiping infection from syphilitic sores. We talk to the people every Sunday, but our words do not reach them, because we have forgotten our mother tongue. It wasn't always like this. The sermons of St. Bernardine of Siena are almost unprintable today, but they reached hearts, because the truth in them was sharp as a sword, and as painful. . . .¹²

I insist that the homiletic problem bears a close connection with the intellectual formation of the seminarian—simply because it has to do with preparing a man to communicate God's revelation intelligently, attractively, and persuasively. What must be done?

First, a new attitude must be created towards homiletics. I am afraid that our Reformation experience and the *ex opere operato* efficacy of the sacraments have made us look on the preaching of the word as a peculiarly Protestant preoccupation (like reading the Bible), unnecessary for a Church that has redemption on its altar and seven easier channels of grace. The point is, preaching is not a sacerdotal elective, to be victimized by pulpit announcements and parking pressures; it is part and parcel of redemption today.

Second, how can a priest preach intelligently if he does not know what preaching is, what its role is in the structure of the Church? Is preaching a direct cause of grace, or only an occasion of grace? If it is a direct cause of grace, how does it differ from the sacraments? How is the efficacy of preaching affected by a priest's learning or ignorance, his holiness or sinfulness, the profundity of his faith or the depth of his doubts?

Third, the seminarian must realize that, if homiletics is not the same thing as theology, effective homiletics is inconceivable without theology. For it is God's revelation that is to be preached, God's word; and this demands knowledge, understanding, insight. It means, too, that the seminarian must somehow be fired by his theology with a craving to communicate it; that he should want the pulpit as a teacher wants a classroom, a scientist a laboratory, a paleographer a manuscript. The priest should yearn to mount the pulpit almost as intensely as he yearns to mount the altar.

Fourth, the seminarian must realize that in today's Church the homily is intimately linked with the liturgy, and the liturgy with Scripture. If, then, he is to preach effectively, he must know liturgy far better than rubrics, the Bible better than any book on his shelf.

Fifth, the seminary must instill a rhetoric geared to effective communication in our time—not an arid, abstract, technical jargon, but language that bites and thrills, the language of a prophet with fire on his lips.

Sixth, today's priest must make his preaching relevant to today's people and today's problems. He must face the fact that his people are living in what many call a post-Christian age, where religion is dubbed irrelevant and God is pronounced dead. Their world is a world where the real is what you can see and hear and touch and taste and feel; where atomic destruction is a daily threat

and its morality hardly touched; where business is so complicated and so competitive that commerce is a jungle and its ethics difficult to discern; where research has created not only wonder drugs but moral issues—issues that agonize hearts and perplex minds. Without deep knowledge of such problems, the preacher will continue to mouth platitudes that do not persuade, bromides that do not sedate.

In a word, to preach effectively, tomorrow's priest must be captivated by revelation, thrilled by worship, in anguish over problems, in love with people, able to translate the thoughts of a living God into the language of living men.

In speaking of seminary substance, I have concentrated on the four years of theology. But if these years are to bear fruit, much must be updated in the years before. I mean a liberal arts program that is genuinely liberal, that humanizes and civilizes, that makes for the free man and the citizen. I mean an insight into what science is, what science is trying to do, the impact of science on religion, the future of religion in a world of science. I mean a philosophy that weds the past with the present, the highest flights of Scholasticism with the best in contemporary thought, essentialism with existentialism, the objective with the personal, truth "out there" and truth "in here." I mean so much more that I had best move on to my second main point.

II. ATMOSPHERE

The intellectual substance of seminary formation is more than a matter of curriculum; it demands an intellectual atmosphere, an environment without which it will petrify and fossilize. There must be, to begin with, a ferment of ideas. Perhaps the most serious threat to genuine intellectualism is an atmosphere where the academic curriculum is primarily a requisite for ordination, something to be "gotten through," endured; where there would be hardly a ripple on the surface if Pope Paul were tomorrow to demand Spanish in place of philosophy, algebra instead of theology. No, philosophy and theology, Scripture and history, liturgy and spirituality—these must be subjects that are part and parcel of the seminarian's self. Sacrament and sacrifice, symbolism and literary genre, Exodus and Ephesians, Origen and Augustine, personalism and Thomism, tradition and development of doctrine, apperception and contra-ception—these are the things he thinks about, talks about, lives.

Such a ferment of ideas calls for communication; for the ferment will fizzle and die unless it is fed and can express itself. I mean communication between student and faculty and between student and student. This will not be possible in an atmosphere where student-faculty contact is subtly discouraged, where an armed neutrality exists between them, where relationship between the two is limited to office hours, is rigidly formal, is a matter of student-question and faculty-answer, is judged by student docility. Nor will a shared ferment prevail where regulations make it legally impossible to communicate save at meals and recreation; where the order of time stifles intellectual initiative; where to cut class is to invite expulsion; where discipline is more important than ideas.

For the intellectual life to flourish, there must be time for personal study, research, contemplation. This is jeopardized by any regimen that calls for five or six hours of class a day, five days a week; where all recreations are compulsory for all; where two hours of private study are proof only of individual ingenuity; where the stress is on keeping them busy, out of trouble.

If the life of the mind is to flower, there must be access to books. Not only the textbook, not primarily the textbook; but the book that stimulates, that opens vistas, that touches the mind with fire. There must be access to periodicals, to the research of today as well as yesterday, to the best in scholarship, non-Catholic too. There must, then, be a library, rich in its holdings, open to the questing mind. For all this, there must be a sensible, intelligent approach to the Index.

If intellectual life is to grow, there can be no complacency—among students or faculty or administration. There can be no Tertullian to tell us: "After Christ Jesus, curiosity is superfluous, searching is a luxury. . . ." ¹³ Complacency makes no sense, not when we are still asking basic questions: What is knowledge? How does the mind work? What is revelation? What is tradition? How does doctrine develop? Not when we find it so discouragingly hard to say what God is. We need once more Origen's fourfold vision of the Christian university. First, recognition of the rights of reason, awareness of the thrilling fact that the Word became flesh not to destroy what was human but to perfect it. Second, the acquisition of knowledge, a sweepingly broad knowledge, the raw materials for the student's contemplation, for his ultimate vision of the real. Third, the indispensable task that is Christian criticism, the intelligent confrontation of the old with the new, the effort to link the highest flights of naked reason with God's revelation, to communicate Clement of Alexandria's insight: "There is one river of truth, but many streams fall into it on this side and on that." Fourth, what the Alexandrians called "piety": not some sort of emotional attachment to God divorced from the functioning of intelligence; rather, a love of truth wherever it may be found—within Hellenism or heresy, in the mind of man or of God—and a profound yearning to include all the scattered fragments of discovered truth under "the Holy Word [Christ], the loveliest thing there is." ¹⁴

If intellectual life is to flower, the atmosphere must be free of fear. Fear that material heresy is an unholy obstacle to holy orders. Fear that difficulties may be mistaken for doubts, spontaneity for imprudence, initiative for aggressiveness, self-confidence for arrogance, criticism for disloyalty, frankness for discourtesy, openness to ideas for frailty in faith. Fear that only the certain is acceptable, that the probable is perilous and the possible impossible. Fear that the new will be suspected, insight ridiculed, intuition impounded, experience exorcised. Fear that certain proper names are improper: fear, therefore, to speak approvingly of Congar and Küng, of de Smedt and de Lubac, of Rousselot and Rahner, of Tavad and Teilhard, of Laurentin and Lyonnet, of Murray and McKenzie, of Janssens and Dutch bishops, of *Commonweal* and *Ramparts* and *New Generation*.

Finally, if the life of the mind is to be relevant, the environment must be ecumenical. This involves a new attitude towards adversaries. It means, in the first place, that in philosophy and theology—in any field—the seminarian will meet not simply the adversary of the past, but the foe of the present. Not that we dare drop the past—not in Catholicism, which *has* a history, which *is* a history, which *learns* (I think) from history. Rather that the seminarian will meet in mind not only the old Nestorius but the new Nestorian; not only a dead Luther but a living Lutheran; Sartre as well as Averroes, Whitehead as well as Kant, Barth as well as Harnack.

It will mean, in the second place, that the adversary is, perhaps for the first time, given his total due: not simply where he is wrong, but where he is right; not only where he has lost the tradition, but where he has kept it, possibly better than we; not only his blind spots, but his insights. In the concrete, we

will recognize that the impetus for so much of contemporary Catholic intellectual activity has come not from "us" but from "them." I mean, too, that "they" have compelled us to look more deeply into aspects of Catholic thought which for decades we have downgraded from a defensive mentality: the direct encounter of the soul with God, even if mediated by Church or sacrament, by priest or Mary; faith as a man's total adhesion to Christ, not simply the mind's adherence to propositions; an ecclesiology concerned with the whole People of God, not only with hierarchy; tradition as the totality of Christian life, deeper and broader than magisterial pronouncements; an apologetic that is less cocksure and more Christian, more aware that history is not a syllogism and the mind not an IBM machine, that we, too, approach Scripture and history and truth with built-in biases; recognition that ecumenism is not for Protestants alone, that the search for unity is a demand on Catholics, too, that we, too, are responsible for division and disunity, for dissension and scandal.

This attitude towards adversaries is neither perilous liberalism nor jesuitical strategy. It is an intelligent attitude towards truth, wherever it exists; an admission that we are not self-sufficient, that we do not have all truth, even all religious truth; a realization that if love without truth is dangerously sentimental, truth without love is coldly unchristian.

Yes, the attitude towards adversaries must be colored by Christian love. It must, I suggest, be the attitude of the late Father Gustave Weigel. One of the most moving tributes to that remarkable man came from the pen of Carl Henry, editor of the fundamentalist fortnightly *Christianity Today*. Dr. Henry wrote:

Father Weigel and this writer attended major ecumenical assemblies and conferences in the role of observer. But one meeting with him stands out, a simple luncheon in a modest Washington restaurant. We had spoken frankly of our own religious pilgrimages and had exchanged theological agreements and differences. Then suddenly, at a point of important dogmatic difference, Dr. Weigel reached a hand across the table and clasped mine. Calling me by name, he said, "I love you." The editor of *Christianity Today* has met scores of Protestant theologians and philosophers of many points of view. None ever demonstrated as effectively as Gustave Weigel that the pursuit of truth must never be disengaged from the practice of love.¹⁵

III. SUGGESTIONS

Finally and briefly, I have several suggestions of a concrete nature. They are not dogmatic pronouncements but personal recommendations; their purpose is not to raise hackles but to stimulate discussion.

First, I endorse the strong affirmation of Father Stafford Poole: "All seminaries, without exception, should be accredited by the State and regional accrediting agencies."¹⁶ I see no validity in the objection voiced recently in a letter to *America*: "I question sincerely if there is anywhere in the United States a State or regional accrediting agency that could properly evaluate a seminary for accreditation."¹⁷ This I contest strongly. I contest it on the basis of firsthand experience of actual seminary accreditation by the Middle States Association. I point out, too, that at least the Middle States does not evaluate a seminary on the basis of some questionable philosophy of education. It asks one fundamental question: To what extent does this seminary successfully implement its own aims and objectives, its own philosophy of education? Moreover, I submit that the most valuable feature of accreditation is the yearlong,

utterly candid, eye-opening self-evaluation an institution is compelled to make before the accrediting team appears.

My second suggestion: Abandon the six-six system of seminary training, because it is an educational anachronism.

Third, a pilot program. In several sections of the country, put one of our seminaries (the liberal arts college or the theological institution) on a university campus: here a Catholic campus, there a secular campus. Put the seminarian in contact with lay students in at least some of his classes. Let him see at first hand how lay people sacrifice for an education. Let him compete with them for marks, academic standing, scholarships. Let him come into personal contact with atheism and agnosticism and existentialism and positivism, with technology and science—even with women! Let him see that the life of the intellect is not simply theory, that the world of ideas is terribly real, that ideas can and do move the world, but that, to move the world, his ideas must first move *him*.

Fourth, to assist these pilot ventures, we need a set of detailed, candid surveys. I mean surveys of existing situations, of seminaries on or at university campuses: from the Catholic University setup to the three-to-five-year program for Jesuits at the University of Melbourne. These surveys should reveal how substantial the relationship is or how thin; defects in the setup; its effect on the man and the mind; lessons for the future.

Finally, we must examine seriously the need for "continuing education." I mean education after ordination, to supplement a heavily philosophical and theological curriculum: education in sociology and social work, in the behavioral sciences, in contemporary philosophy; contemporary theology, contemporary Scripture too, especially as the years flow on, as knowledge continues to explode, as the mind of the active priest threatens to stagnate.

Let me end on an optimistic note—a paragraph from John Cogley in Rome:

Eager, idealistic seminarians, it is no secret, have frequently grown up to be complacent clerics. The seminary radical of yesterday is often the self-satisfied pastor of today. I am old enough to have seen that happen again and again. But I have hopes, solidly founded I believe, that the present generation of seminarians will be priests the like of which we have never seen. Not in spite of but because of the recent emphasis on the vocation of the layman, they have a surer grasp of their own calling. They are, in general, getting a better education than those who went before them. Because most of them keep up with theological developments, they are in touch with lively minds and benefit from an enriched understanding of Catholicism. Thanks to the ecumenical movement, they are more open-minded and less sectarian than earlier generations of clerics. Thanks to the questioning and critical mood of the last two Popes and many of the bishops at the Council, they are less likely to develop hardening of the intellectual arteries at an early age. Thanks to the reassessments and re-evaluations taking place on all sides in the Catholic world, they are asking themselves the hard questions about Christianity in the modern world and stand a good chance of stumbling on the right answers.¹⁸

FOOTNOTES

1. Stafford Poole, "Tomorrow's Seminaries," *America* 110, No. 3 (Jan. 18, 1964), 90.

2. Charles Davis, "Theology in Seminary Confinement," *Downside Review* 81, No. 265 (Oct., 1963), 307-16.

3. *Ibid.*, 311.

4. *Ibid.*, 316.
5. *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* 16 (trans. Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minn., 1963, p. 15).
6. Paschal Baute, "The Work of the Pastoral Counselor," *Insight* 2 (1963), 6.
7. Cf. *ibid.*, 4.
8. Cf. *ibid.*, 5.
9. H. Van Zeller, *We Die Standing Up* (New York: Doubleday, 1961) p. 112.
10. Francis J. Braceland, M.D., and Michael Stock, O.P., *Modern Psychiatry: A Handbook for Believers* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963) p. 322.
11. Cf. Walter J. Burghardt, S.J., "From Classroom to Pulpit: How Preach Dogma?" *Proceedings of the Catholic Homiletic Society, Fourth Annual Convention* (Dec., 1961) pp. 23-35.
12. Morris L. West, *The Devil's Advocate* (New York: William Morrow, 1959) pp. 81-82.
13. Tertullian, *The Prescription of Heretics*, 7.
14. Gregory Thaumaturgus, *Panegyric on Origen*, 6.
15. Carl Henry, in *Christianity Today* 8, No. 9 (Jan 31, 1964), 412.
16. Poole, *art. cit.*, 88.
17. William J. Murphy, in *America* 110, No. 13 (Mar. 28, 1964), 425.
18. John Cogley, "Changing Roles in the Church," *Commonweal* 80, No. 1 (Mar. 27, 1964), 7.

The Cultural Formation of the Future Priest

RT. REV. MSGR. ROBERT C. WOLFF, PH.D.

Rector, College Department, Borromeo Seminary, Wickliffe, Ohio

WE ARE HERE CONCERNED with two things: "culture" and the "future priest." It is the task of the seminary to preserve and to hand on to the future priest some of the most highly prized elements of knowledge and belief from our cultural heritage. It is likewise the task of the seminary to train the seminarian to raise and Christianize cultural thinking and life in the world today. The seminary hopes to accomplish this cultural formation by striving to follow the ideals set before her by the Church and by directing her liberal arts and fine arts program toward a realization of this goal.

What cultural ideals has the Church set before us? Pope Paul VI in his address to the clergy of the Diocese of Rome on June 24, 1963, stresses the vital role that the priest must play in the Christianization of society:

As Christ established, and the Church constantly proclaims, the evangelization of the world—even of our modern world which is so secular and often so hostile to religion—depends chiefly on the clergy. Probably no age before the present has been either by nature or by deliberate intention, as alien and opposed to the priesthood and to its religious mission. And yet no age before ours has shown itself as needful of, or even (a source of great hope to us) as susceptible to, the pastoral assistance of good and zealous priests. This is a well-known fact. But what great importance it assumes for those who are responsible, thoughtful and anxious for the true prosperity of modern society! What a secret message it can sound in the hearts of young people who feel the eager desire for a mission, for heroism, for

the vocation of giving to our marvelous yet fearful modern world a new and vital Christian culture.¹

The thinking and belief, the norms and values, the attitudes and practices of society must be raised and Christianized; and the clergy must assume this task in the modern world.

Shortly after Pope Paul addressed the clergy of Rome, he talked to a group of Greek seminarians and then to a group of Roman seminarians. His remarks seemed to tie in with his earlier talk, for he gave as the basis and source of our modern Christian culture, our Greco-Roman heritage. To the Greek seminarians he exclaimed:

Greece! As you can well imagine, this magnificent name stirs up countless memories in our heart. Indeed, are we not all disciples of Greece to some extent? Has she not left on us all the imprint of her history and language, her art and her philosophy, and her place in the Christian tradition? Her saints, her patristic literature, and her liturgy are revered throughout the Christian world.²

Then in a speech to the major and minor seminarians of the Diocese of Rome, he reminded these future priests that Rome's blessed soil yields great lessons in magnanimity, spiritual vitality, heroism, and self-dedication to the point of martyrdom.

Let each one strive to penetrate, to get to know the treasury of traditions that Rome offers with splendid largesse. In a word, let the seminarians of today, the priests of tomorrow, be profoundly and singularly impressed and marked by the very special sacredness of the traditions of the City of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul.³

Before the beginning of the second session of the Vatican Council, Pope Paul cautioned bishops and priests to retain the truly worthwhile in our Christian culture while accomplishing the task of modernization in the Church. *Aggiornamento*, or pastoral updating, did not mean a destruction of cultural tradition, but rather a renewal of the "eternal values of Christian truth and their insertion in the dynamic reality of human life, so extraordinarily changeable today." *Aggiornamento* "indicates the relative and experimental aspect of the ministry of salvation, which has nothing more greatly at heart than to be efficacious, and which sees how much its efficacy is conditioned by the cultural, moral, and social state of the souls to which it is directed."⁴ An essential part of cultural formation, then, is an application of Christian culture to modern society.

In the section on priestly formation in *Menti Nostrae*, Pius XII calls upon seminaries to educate students for the priesthood in a Christian culture adapted to all the classes in their social contacts. The future priest must be able to deal "either with the ordinary people or the educated classes," so that he will not "either act inconsiderately toward the faithful or be contemptuous of the education they have received."⁵ Today, people are more educated; their cultural background is richer. One out of every

1. Paul VI, "Address to the Clergy of the Diocese of Rome," June 24, 1963.

2. Paul VI, "Address to Greek Seminarians," July 7, 1963.

3. Paul VI, "Address to Major and Minor Seminarians of the Diocese of Rome," June 27, 1963.

4. Paul VI, "Address to Italian Bishops and Priests," June, 1963.

5. Pius XII, *Menti Nostrae*, September 23, 1950.

three youths of college age are in college in the United States. It follows that the cultured priest will be a more effective priest in his apostolate, whether it be in preaching or teaching, whether it be in parish work or civic contacts. Pius XII puts the gospel dictum to become "all things to all men" in concrete terms:

In this matter, it is our most earnest wish that, in literary and scientific studies, future priests should at least be in no way inferior to lay students who follow corresponding courses. If this precaution is observed, the thorough mental training of the student will be adequately provided for, and it will also be easier to select candidates when the time comes.⁶

It would make an interesting digression at this stage of our discussion to speculate on the cultural level necessary for entrance into the seminary. Our lack of vocations from rural Catholics, Negro Catholics, and industrial Catholics seems to be due in a large part to their lower cultural level. The high incidence of vocations from among the more cultured students in our middle-class areas seems to show that there is a cultural attraction in the priesthood. It is not the "cultured set" which attracts them. Eric Gill says that the clergy is "not a cultured set. It will never be a cultured set—a set having a culture different from or better than that in which it moves."⁷ But it is a higher level of culture and a Christian type culture that attracts candidates. What, then, is this culture, and how can it be formed and molded into the priestly character?

Culture is a rather vague term, difficult to define. In its root meaning, it refers to the act or process of tilling the soil. Such a meaning is easily applied to cultural training in the seminary. If the hope of the harvest is in the seed (*spes messis in semine*), then the hope of the seed is in the soil (the cultural environment of seminary education). Culture today is understood as the total pattern of life and thought in society. In education, culture is the improvement and refinement of the mind and emotions through a study of civilization and through a formation in the sensitive appreciation of the true, the good, and the beautiful in the arts. Christian culture emphasizes Christian civilization in history, and Christian ideals in the arts.

Modern advocates of Christian culture stress the higher faculties of man which are involved in tradition and formation. John Henry Newman, for example, points out the need in cultural development for the "systematic use, improvement and combination of those faculties which are characteristic of man."

Culture or civilization is that state to which man's nature points and tends; it is the systematic use, improvement, and combination of those faculties which are his characteristic; and viewed in its idea, it is the perfection, the happiness of our moral state. It is the development of art out of nature, and of self-government out of passion, and of certainty out of opinion, and of faith out of reason.⁸

G. K. Chesterton sees in culture the triumph of the human spirit over external forces of nature.

Culture or civilization in the best sense merely means the full authority of the

6. *Ibid.*

7. Eric Gill, *Beauty Looks After Herself*.

8. John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*.

human spirit over all externals. Barbarism means the worship of those externals in their crude and unconquered state. Barbarism is the worship of nature.⁹

Christopher Dawson distinguishes between the cultural content of our inheritance and the educational use to which we put it.

Every form of education that mankind has known, from the savage tribe to the highest forms of culture has always involved two elements—the element of technique and the element of tradition; and hitherto it has always been the second that has been the more important. In the first place education teaches children how to do things—how to read and write, and even at a much more primitive level how to hunt and cook and plant and build. But besides all these things, education has always meant the initiation of the young into the social and spiritual inheritance of the community; in other words education has meant the transmission of culture.¹⁰

According to Dawson, culture in its Christian concept is not “some ideal pattern of social perfection which can be used as a sort of model or blueprint by which existing societies can be judged,” but in its historical reality, “Christian culture is a living force which has entered into the lives of men and societies and changed them in proportion to their will and capacity.”¹¹

Today, Christian culture is not a living force in society. In fact, it is fighting for existence as a tradition against the forces of secularism and naturalism. The living Church must build anew a vital cultural force. In the early Christian era, the Church developed out of ancient cultures a strong Christian tradition that carried through the patristic and monastic ages. In the medieval Church, St. Thomas Aquinas preserved and united the culture of the early Church around philosophy and theology. Today, a new Augustine, a new Aquinas, is needed to preserve and Christianize the cultural forces of our time.

Seminary higher education today, more than any other educational force, faces this challenge of becoming more than ever what it professes to be: a channel of transmission of Christian culture. It can accomplish this in two ways: first, by intensifying its liberal arts program and centering this program around the integrating subjects of philosophy and theology; and, secondly, by relating the body of truths, the habits of mind, and the higher endeavors that we call Christian into a cultural outlook on life that is truly contemporary and healthfully modern. At the same time that we resist the undermining influences of progressive education, we must relate the truths of our Christian heritage to modern circumstances and needs.

That the liberal arts are the vital core of Catholic seminary education is a proposition that few will care to controvert. That the seminary curriculum has preserved that core unchanged by the wishy-washy relativism of modern education is a triumphant fact to which every seminary educator can point with pride. Properly presented, our seminary curriculum is not identified with any epoch, patristic, monastic, or medieval. It is ever ancient, ever new; it is the same yesterday, today, and forever, because the essential reality of truths, beliefs, norms, and values remain the same. But that curriculum must not become too narrow in its concept or too historical in its orientation.

The Tridentine seminary presupposed the existence and operation of a

9. G. K. Chesterton, *All Things Considered*.

10. Christopher Dawson, *Religious Perspectives*.

11. Christopher Dawson, *Understanding Europe*.

university to supply a general cultural background and a liberalizing influence. St. Charles Borromeo founded his seminary as a clerical training school of philosophy and theology on a Catholic university campus. He invited visiting professors to teach and train the seminarians in related subjects. Cultural training was enriched by outside influences.

In many instances our seminarians have detached themselves from university life and have lost breadth and depth in important areas of the liberal arts curriculum—especially in history, literature, and the physical and social sciences. If we wish to keep our seminaries as tightly knit organizations as they are now, we must compensate for the loss of outside influences by establishing strong departments in history, literature, and science. The attitude that any priest can teach history or Latin or English has hurt the quality of our teaching as well as our status among college educators. Departments should be established in these fields, faculties trained, and co-operative efforts with outside colleges and faculties encouraged to remedy weaknesses in our liberal arts program.

Another problem stemming from certain weaknesses in the curriculum supporting the courses in philosophy and theology is the problem of cultural integration. The relationship of the various liberal arts courses must be clear to the seminarian. Yet, all too often the seminarian is unaware of the total effect and the overall cultural goal of individual courses. A concrete illustration in cultural terms might help pinpoint the problem.

Many of us are familiar with the fine living rooms of some of our well-to-do friends. I have in mind just such a room. It is spacious, filled with exquisite furniture and rare art objects. There are a few pieces of antique New England furniture. The ceremonial costume of a Russian priest (*riza*) is fastened on one of the walls. Side by side with it there is a picture of a famous Japanese school of painting. Then there are two works of a French impressionist, and one by a prominent cubistic painter. There are also an Italian primitive, two genuine statues of Buddha imported from Siam, two Chinese vases of the T'ang period, and several other treasures of different times and countries. On the floors, antique oriental rugs lie near a hooked rug of old New England. The living room is a "culture area." Now the question arises: Is the culture represented by the living room an integrated whole, or is it a mere spatial conglomeration of various things (each valuable separately but all somehow a part of our cultural heritage and therefore more valuable in their totality)?

Seminarians facing a liberal arts curriculum must be as confused with the relation of courses to one another and to their total cultural impact as the artistically ignorant might be in this "culture room." Something of the job of relating and synthesizing obviously must be left up to the intelligence of the individual student; but some guidance is needed. Why not revise the class syllabus for the freshman course in World History or Western Civilization? Suggest that less time be spent on historical dates and facts and more time be spent in outlining the cultural elements in Western Civilization that will coordinate the study of history, literature, philosophy, and theology for the major seminary program. If you have someone who can at least point out the cultural trends and Christian elements, this might very well be the most fruitful course offered at the beginning of college. Or, perhaps, it would be better taught later in the major seminary curriculum when some mastery of the content of history and literature, philosophy and theology, would make the synthesis more meaningful.

And why cannot every seminary teacher "flick" Christian cultural elements into every course to tie in the related background and to integrate the course with the whole liberal arts program? Although priest-professors should not be expected to teach every seminary course, still their seminary training in philosophy and theology should help them point out the relationship. Moreover, what is there to prevent team teaching between the various departments by inviting visiting professors to handle areas of special interest in a related subject?

Although a course in Christian culture would help integrate courses around philosophy and theology, we know that the existence of an already overloaded curriculum in the major seminary would preclude the addition of a separate cultural course. Besides, cultural training is not forced; official proclamation will not effect it. Rather, there could be introduced into all courses objectives and methods which will lead students into digging beneath the surface of the immediate subject matter and will challenge them to relate these deeper issues to philosophy and theology. In this way the study of Christian culture would not become an end in itself, but it would serve instead as an integrating influence in the liberal arts experience in the seminary, supporting the master disciplines of philosophy and theology.

Mass culture is a phenomenon of our time. Not only are more laymen graduating from college with a greater understanding of and appreciation for the good, the true, and the beautiful in literature, music, and art; but cultural centers are rising in the major cities in the country to interest and inspire citizens in the higher things of life. And this is a step in the right direction. The essential work of the priesthood—the salvation of souls—can be and has been forwarded in the midst of an almost total cultural aridity. But it ought also to be recognized that in the development of man's full potential, in the lifting God-ward of his frequently errant and antithetical powers, a benign culture can be an aid to his progress as well as a sign of his achievement.

The future priest must rise to meet this cultural challenge. Church music, Church art, and Church literature must advance to meet the demands of the faithful for better things. Never before, in our own age at least, have the opportunities for an advance in Church music and Church art been opened so effectively as in the chapters on these subjects in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy promulgated December 4, 1963, by Vatican Council II. Its treatment at first seems to be merely an epitome of recent papal documents, especially those of Pius XII. Closer reading, however, reveals that it is all this and much more besides. In the background of the liturgical constitution, the treatment is positive, unique, almost revolutionary, and filled with a wondrous future.

In this constitution, Church music is clearly situated in its liturgical context—neither politely bowed to nor treated as something tolerable, ever in need of a stern and watchful eye. This new approach says that liturgy and Church music are clearly not for the professionals but for the people. And the people are to take serious part, not remain detached spectators. There is repeated and almost miraculous insistence on living language for the lyrics; the urgent invitation to modern musicians to take their vocation seriously and provide the kind of music needed by the people ("the active participation of the entire assembly of the faithful"); and the constant pointing to essentials, with a corresponding need to prune away ceremonial additions that are "far from clear to the people of today": all are part of the new positive climate.

The *aggiornamento* in music has begun, and it would be calamitous for priests and future priests if a lack of interest and preparation would allow it to bog down in what Cardinal Suenens calls "inertia, routine, and spiritual or intellectual laziness, which everywhere favor a policy of no change." At this critical moment, priests must encourage liturgists and musicologists to produce church music in the new spirit and then they must courageously encourage lay participation in church music.

Church art received generous support from Pius XII. Take, for example, his deep insight into art: "The function of all art lies in breaking through the narrow boundary of the finite, in which man is immersed while living here below, and in providing for his hungry soul a window to the infinite."¹² He goes on to call artists "interpreters of God's perfections and of God's creation." There is no reluctance here. Neither is there in Cardinal Montini's superbly positive address to the Catholic Union of Italian Artists on February 2, 1962, entitled "The Phenomenon of Art in the Light of Faith." This little-known document appeared recently in the *Liturgical Arts* magazine.

Within this framework we can more easily grasp the all-embracing attitude of the Council toward the fine arts when it describes them as "among the noblest activities of man's genius." Vatican II then opens the door to present-day art, explicitly admitting the concept of changes in styles and techniques while refusing to "adopt any particular style as her very own." Further, the Council insists that new church buildings "be adapted to different regions," "avoid sumptuous display," and "be suitable for the celebration of liturgical services and for the active participation of the faithful."

Even more important to us at the moment is paragraph 129, which provides that future priests all "be taught about the history and development of sacred art," so that they may be "in a position to aid, by good advice, artists who are engaged in producing works of art." If this decree of the Council is implemented, some of us may actually live to see churches as vital and worthy as those of certain periods of the past. Eric Gill sums up the reaction of the cultured layman to cheap art: "A man can be a very good Catholic in a factory. How true! But the fact remains that factory-made art . . . is a very bad thing for making Catholics. If it be hard for a rich man to pass through the eye of a needle, it is no less hard for many men rich in culture to pass through the door of a modern church."¹³

A good Sulpician once said that there are two things which the future priest must take away from the seminary with him: the practice of meditation and the enjoyment of a hobby. Meditation provides his priestly inspiration; the hobby supplies human balance and natural enjoyment. Might we not go one step further and recommend that this hobby be found in one of the arts. By arts I mean any creative work generally, the making or doing of things that have form and beauty. Besides music, literature, and drama, there might be one of the graphic arts: painting, sculpture, or architecture.

In preparation for this artistic hobby, there should figure strongly in every seminary extracurricular programs in the fine arts—cultural and creative organizations and activities that will refine the mind, emotions, manners, and tastes of the seminarian. Fine music, art, and literature must be available to all.

12. Pius XII, "Address on Church Art," April 8, 1952.

13. Gill, *Beauty Looks After Herself*.

Efforts to encourage understanding and appreciation should accompany these opportunities.

Music training in the seminary should find its center and highest expression in the liturgical music. Chant and polyphonic classes should instruct not only in the techniques of singing sacred music but also in historical background and artistic appreciation. We have found that a music appreciation course for one hour a week during one of the philosophy semesters is an excellent addition to regular chant classes. Otherwise, most cultural training in music is best developed on a graduated, natural basis. Quiet recreation rooms equipped with high fidelity equipment and stocked with a wide range of classical and semiclassical records establish the proper atmosphere for a love of fine music. Here are some programs we have tried; you might find them helpful:

1. A seminary orchestra or band to encourage group effort in the more serious jazz idiom, chamber music, or musical comedy scores.
2. A seminary record club to purchase classical and semiclassical records and to run a weekly program of appreciation in the quiet recreation or reading room.
3. A seminary hootenanny to inspire interest in folk singing and folklore.
4. A Sunday morning student broadcast over the seminary P.A. system accompanied by student narration of explanatory material.
5. A "Listening Library" of classical records connected to the reading room of the library where students may read or refer to explanatory material while listening to stereo music through earphones.
6. A yearly musical of the Gilbert and Sullivan variety put on by the students for the benefit of the house.
7. A monthly feature in the library of music periodicals or music appreciation materials to encourage private reading.

Facilities and materials are steadily increasing for seminarians who are interested in bookbinding, painting, woodworking, model-building, silk-screening, sculpturing, and similar projects. Many of these hobbies and creative activities are helpful in summer counseling work at camp, and many are important hobbies for the future priest. Quigley Seminary South in Chicago now offers a formal course in art as an elective in the preparatory seminary. Father Austin Graff established the course, and Mrs. Barbara Harrigan, a teacher from a nearby parochial school, teaches the weekly art course in the seminary. The rector of Quigley South, Monsignor Howard, was quoted as saying in an article in the September, 1963 issue of *U.S. Catholic*:

We feel that the seminarians need this appreciation of art—as a part of the whole man. And the priest needs standards of taste to avoid some of the terrible monstrosities we see today in church art and architecture. Priests and pastors whom I know, who have an appreciation for art and architecture, often tell me that they wish they had had such an opportunity to learn the fundamentals of art. So we are now trying to give the seminarians this training.¹⁴

Although we do not have a formal course in art at our seminary, we did have a cultural day last year devoted to a student art exhibit, music

14. James Maloney, C.M.F., "Seminarians Study Art," *U. S. Catholic*, September, 1963.

festival and modern drama. From the stimulus of the creative effort, many students expressed a keen interest in further cultural activities. It was evident from their own powerful interaction that the students teach each other more artistic appreciation than we realize. They suspect that the faculty is trying to brainwash them in matters cultural, but when a fellow student freely elicits their support, they respond more willingly to the influence.

At the risk of sounding like a kindergarten teacher describing her bulletin board projects, let me list again some suggestions that you might find helpful:

1. A descriptive catalog mimeographed by the students that lists the paintings and stained glass windows in the seminary with a short description and critique of each.
2. An art lending library where reproductions of famous paintings are loaned to students to hang on the walls of their rooms.
3. Exhibits of Christian art by local art guilds or distributors.
4. Lectures by prominent artists and critics.
5. A sacred art judging contest where students pick the most appealing and least appealing painting on a given theme.
6. Conducted tours through a nearby art museum during seasonal exhibits or special showings.

Mere exposure to music and art is not sufficient. Conferences on culture that feature Eastern as well as Western art; programs in aesthetics that point out common qualities of beauty—these should accompany extracurricular activities. At our college seminary we have a weekly quarter-hour conference during the full four years. The faculty member is well versed in comparative literatures and creative expression. His talks range through world literature, creative writing, aesthetic principles of criticism, the Church's attitude toward various art forms and philosophies.

Finally, seminarians should have an opportunity to publish their literary achievements in a student literary magazine. The English department should direct and staff the student paper and strive for high grammatical and literary quality. Dramatic programs, choral readings, skits, and communication arts forums among the seminarians would round out a well-run literary program. Why not try:

1. A listening library of tapes and records of famous dramas, speeches, and readings as an adjunct to the literature section of the library.
2. The featuring of a monthly literary magazine in the library.
3. A literary lecture series inviting creative writers in the publications and communications fields.
4. A short story, poetry, or speech contest to encourage creative contributions.

Clubs are not always a big attraction to the overburdened seminarian who seeks less organized programs for his recreation. But we have experimented with a World Affairs Club that discusses current problems under the direction of the history department, assembles pertinent information, and publishes a short paper highlighting its findings. We plan on organizing a Spoken Arts Forum, according to the plan of the Catholic Homiletic Society, to gain student practice and confidence in public speaking through informally organized speaking situations. A Photography Club and an Arts and Crafts Club complete the student organizational picture.

While extracurricular activities give the seminarians free and unorganized cultural opportunities, they should not be haphazard and disorganized. The

backbone of a constant cultural influence is the lecture series and the library. Monthly lectures by some prominent local or national figure from the arts field further stimulates student reaction and expression. Student-sponsored forums with knowledgeable priests and laity participating and student-conducted programs in philosophy, history, and communications complete the challenge to cultural initiative.

Of course, the library must be rich in cultural offerings to meet the challenge. The medieval proverb that a *monastery without a library is like a castle without an armory* might be updated to read: The seminary library without a fine arts collection is like a rocket without fuel. Does your seminary library provide adequate coverage in the cultural and creative fields? And more important: Does the library do anything to stimulate interest in the easily overlooked volumes of music, art, and literature? Do periodicals and holdings effectively introduce the browsing seminarian to contemporary fine art?

Field trips can bring the seminarian into contact with outside cultural influences. This is where the wall of separation between the seminary and the world can be most profitably breached. Visits to the local art museum, music hall, planetarium, playhouse, observatory, and library give the seminarian professional contacts today that the seminary cannot hope to duplicate. Here the power of associating their moments of freedom and joy with the fine arts carries over into vacations. Sometimes just an announcement on current plays, symphonies, operas, and art exhibits is sufficient to get them to attend cultural events on their own.

As part of our yearly self-survey in the seminary program, I took a student poll on participation in cultural activities at Borromeo. If we are so concerned about student attendance at spiritual exercises and student participation in the sports program, why are we not equally concerned about student interest in cultural activities? So I listed forty cultural efforts at the seminary and asked them to check the areas in which they participated in the past year: music, literature, clubs, arts and crafts, special programs, and field trips. The results showed that seminarians are reacting satisfactorily to the program. Fourteen percent of the 160 college seminarians tested reported that they participated in five or less, 67 percent reported engaging in six to fourteen activities, and 19 percent acknowledged using fifteen or more of the opportunities provided.

According to a second questionnaire on culture in the curriculum, plans for increasing the effectiveness of cultural training in the formation of the future priest should include the following five principles:

1. *Make philosophy and theology the true "core" subjects in the formation of a Christian culture.* Half of the students that I questioned in our major seminary mistakenly gave the central position to history or literature. Culture is the total pattern of thought and life in society. The culture of all peoples includes a tremendous amount of knowledge about the physical and social worlds, about life and the way to live. Philosophy and theology supply from reason and faith the basic truths and ethics of man's life. History tells us how man has thought and lived; literature expresses man's thoughts in beautiful language and gives life to his beliefs.

2. *Make cultural formation the ACME of the liberal arts and fine arts training in the seminary, i.e., American, Christian, Modern, and Excellent.* The majority of seminarians that I tested (over two-thirds) thought that training in our cultural heritage and tradition was merely the means to end—

the formation of the Christian gentleman. Our historical coverage of Christian culture in the Western World is sufficient, but we do not make clear what the priest of today should have as his ideal of Christian culture, an ideal that should be Eastern as well as Western, American as well as European.

3. *Initiate an aggiornamento in philosophy and history by relating Thomistic philosophy and Church history to modern philosophies and modern world problems.* Two-thirds of the major seminarians agreed with the charge of Father Bernard Haring: "One of the tasks before the Church in this century should be the reassessment of the philosophy of St. Thomas. Scholastic philosophy must face up to the thoughts of Sartre, Jaspers, Heidegger. . . ." An equal number agreed with the challenge of Father Eugene Burke that church history should be changed to "A truly effective instrument in the development of a cultural tradition."

4. *Integrate cultural content through inter-departmental teaching, inter-seminary student exchange, and, if necessary, survey courses in Christian culture.* Seventy percent of the seminarians reported that they profited by cooperative efforts between departments. Most seminarians (72 percent) thought that an exchange student program, here or abroad, would be helpful to combat provincialism. A faculty with a diversified cultural background would be the next best thing. While 62 percent favored a survey course in Christian culture either at the beginning or end of the major seminary program, they feared adding a course to an overloaded curriculum; they feared, also, the adverse effect that forced culture might have on a program that should be as progressive and natural as possible.

5. *Review the curriculum for a revision of a number of historically oriented classes in sociology, literature, and psychology into modern behavioral courses in social studies, aesthetics, and experimental psychology.* Future priests are concerned with the practical application of principles and theories. The stress placed on social problems by the encyclicals, the emergence of a modern culture among the laity and the increased concern for psychological counseling in character problems were the reasons offered for a change in emphasis.

Whether or not further additions might be made to these five suggestions, the fact remains that we must continue to review, evaluate, and strengthen our position. Christopher Dawson says that the anti-Christian nature of undermining influences attacking our culture today shows the relevance of Christianity to the problems of the present age. He concludes that "the outlook for Christian culture is brighter than it has been for a considerable time—perhaps even two hundred and fifty years." Spiritual changes are taking place, the barriers between religion and social life are weakening, and "the new situation opens the way for a new Christian movement of advance."¹⁵

Differentiated Discipline in the Seminary*

REV. EUGENE C. KENNEDY, M.M., PH.D.

Counseling Psychologist, Maryknoll Seminary, Glen Ellyn, Illinois; Loyola University, Chicago

THE OXFORD DICTIONARY, in giving us the meaning of the word discipline, gives us also a history of seminary training. The word, related to the Latin word *discipulus*, originally meant the instruction of disciples. From an emphasis on teaching it has come to mean a system of rules for conduct or a system by which order is maintained in the Church. It has a religious meaning of correction or chastisement. So a word that originally signified "to educate" or "to train" has come to mean "to bring under control." These meanings catch the attitudes that even you and I may have experienced toward training future priests. We would like to make disciples of them but sometimes the problem seems just to keep them under control.

The task, however, has never really changed, and it is mature disciples that the Church needs. It is this task with which we have been charged, and, although it is currently fashionable to criticize seminary educators, I think we can be proud of the progressive tradition of American seminary education. It is that tradition which has brought us together today.

We do not have to listen long for voices to criticize us. In the February, 1964, issue of *Jubilee Magazine*, we find these words in the mouth of an interviewed priest: "Seminaries in general, I think, are too tightly disciplined. There is a stifling of initiative; and almost complete separation from life; a hothouse environment which delays maturity and the development of natural and social virtues. . . . It's hard for a seminarian to know exactly what a seminary is supposed to be. Mostly, he just conforms to the wishes of the Rector."

There is hardly any doubt that the layman has emerged when we listen to Daniel Callahan being extremely critical of seminaries in his book *The Mind of the Catholic Layman*. "It is not at all clear," he says, "that this systematic erasing of many important and normally laudable human traits—initiative, self-direction and psychological independence—is actually the best way to produce a clergy capable of understanding the unique spiritual needs of the modern world." In the updating of the Church, these voices seem to plead, the seminary should not be left behind. I would like to discuss the psychological conditions for the growth and development of our seminarians into a generation of disciples truly attuned to the needs of their times. I would like to propose a startlingly simple thesis but one that I have never heard presented before.

I suggest that we try to make conditions in seminaries, convents, rec-tories, and other houses of training and religious life as normal as possible. I am using normal in the sense of "healthy," not in the sense of "average." The reasons are clear. First of all, healthy people thrive in normal condi-

* Delivered at a joint session of the Major and Minor Seminary Departments.

tions, and, secondly, abnormal people stand out clearly as ill-fitting in a normal setting. This is not a plea without many echoes in the world today. The efforts to modernize religious habits, the struggle to make real schools out of seminaries, the repeated papal theme that our task is to become a part of our age: all these say that we may have gone too far in many ways in being different from the world around us. "Worldly" has suddenly taken on a refurbished meaning. Where it used to connote evil and weakness, it has suddenly come to describe that part of the universe we are meant to transform, "becoming like man in all things except sin."

We know that grace builds on nature, and, in our pursuit of perfection, we must surely discover the favorable conditions for natural growth and maturity. Supernatural perfection can never be rooted in abnormal and unnatural environments. To say that something is supernatural is not to say that it is not natural. We do not contrast the healthy with the supernatural. We see them related as a building to its foundations. Unfortunately, however, and for rather involved historical reasons, many practices that can only be described as unhealthy have been baptized and are found in ecclesiastical and religious training houses. These practices or values are often preserved under the guise of tradition and people hesitate to question them. This creates a peculiar situation. Quite often the normal person in religion is made to feel guilty because he cannot lead an abnormal life perfectly. On the other hand, abnormal people are not only tolerated but are often rewarded because they can lead such an abnormal life almost perfectly.

What I am saying is not that everything we have been doing is wrong, but that we should take a good look at some of the things we have had a rather absolute faith in as means to develop men. Normal people just do not grow in a healthy way in abnormal atmospheres any more than flowers grow in a closet. The only places in which abnormal things develop and occur are in abnormal institutions, such as prisons and other places where the pattern of life is necessarily distorted. Families that are broken produce children who are crippled emotionally. Perhaps some examples would be instructive.

If you have ever seen a sister or a seminarian or, perhaps even a seminary professor, visit the home of his brother or sister who is married and has small children, you will understand something of the way our values can change. A youngster tumbles through the front door, home from school again, brimming with the sense of rich surprise that fills the life of the very young. Perhaps his shoe comes off, or his glove, or he drops a book on the floor. The sister or the seminarian becomes very uneasy until that shoe or that glove or that book is picked up, until, in other words, the good order of the room has been restored. That would be the first thing they would see and they would feel very restless until things could be made neat again. But the mother of the family doesn't value these things in quite the same way. Cleanliness, she understands, is only next to Godliness and she emphasizes her relationship with the child, a child who needs her attention, her love and her greeting in this daily encounter. And she gets the glove or the book or the shoe picked up, too, but first things have come first.

That mother, in being so personally a mother with her child, is fulfilling her vocation in a wonderful way and also helping create the conditions in that home in which her child will grow up in very mature fashion. She knows how to love that child, just as she knows how to get the house cleaned up, and just as she knows how to correct him when that is necessary. But she puts the emphasis on *him*, not on the furniture, or merely, to quote

a familiar phrase, on "the good order of the house." This is not a secret or a great psychological discovery on her part. She is just an example of how healthy families live when they have a Christian sense of values. It is the vision of real values that we must have if this process of making disciples is going to be successful. Perhaps it is abnormal, after all, for convents to look as though nobody lived in them, a little antiseptically inhuman.

Seminary education, like the raising of a good family or the meaning of a real marriage, has to be a personal enterprise. We cannot rely on schedules and rules, no matter how keenly they are devised or how efficiently they allow us to run our institution. The main value is the development of the person of the seminarians and everything else must be seen in relationship to that. I am only saying again that what we have to try to do is what is normal and healthy. It is no wonder at times that people in the world can only shake their heads at us when we explain some piece of procedure or some intricacy of rule or regulation. We could all give many examples but one will suffice. What kind of distortion of life is it in the convent I heard of recently where the sisters are never allowed to speak at meals but they are allowed to take their meals in the recreation room in order to get around the Rule? What could be further removed from the real life world than this manipulation of regulations and this rationalization of behaviour? It is not enough to say that it is supernatural. God must be weary of our heaping our inadequacies at His door. He must be tired of our explaining every failure or inexcusable abnormality as part of Providential preparation for life. It is unhealthy to have a built-in guarantee that we are never really wrong.

Let us consider some other examples. A great mass of psychological testing has revealed a curious truth about the typical American seminarian. While he has a great desire to help other people, he has a built-in difficulty in making easy relationships with them. While part of his basic motivation for the priestly life is to reach out to others, he finds that this is difficult to do because he is shyer and more self-conscious than his peers. The seminarian, however, rates highly on characteristics like self-control or self-discipline. It is clear that the seminarian, whose priesthood should be marked by fruitful communication with other men, needs some development of his social self. Sometimes, however, seminaries merely reinforce what the seminarian is already good at (self-control) by insisting on practices which further inhibit the very kind of social development he most needs. It is common, for example, to insist on a great deal of silence in seminaries. But this is an easy kind of discipline for the shy person and may, in fact, protect him from a healthier social development. Silence is undoubtedly a condition for meditation and real thought, but making rules against speaking guarantees neither of these. A normal, reflective person will seek out periods of quiet as a part of his healthy adjustment to life. He does this while retaining the freedom to communicate and without having to feel guilty about it. Seminaries often seem to propound the idea that large periods of silence are productive in themselves of mature growth. However, this insistence on separation, detachment, aloofness from one's fellows, creates a distinctly abnormal atmosphere where the very values of contemplation are never achieved. This placing of a premium on distance in human relationships goes against the very basic and Christian notion that man never grows alone. The mature man is a social product of wholesome relationships with his fellowman. Just how wholesome are the atmospheres

in our seminaries? That will be the measure of the maturity of the priests who leave them on ordination day.

In a study of one hundred hospitalized priests, Vandervelt and McAllister discuss the fifteen of the priests who were diagnosed as sociopaths. A sociopath is withdrawn and poorly related to others. A comment of the authors is interesting:

The fifteen sociopaths among the clergy group are rather striking. Seminary training and the clerical life lend themselves easily to lack of duration and depth in inter-personal relationships. For many the "spirit of detachment" becomes synonymous with "fugitive, fleeting, involvement with other people," words which Sullivan used so aptly to describe the sociopath. Sociopaths are perhaps attracted to the challenge of the clerical life, since they need to prove themselves. They are perhaps more comfortable in the impersonal relationships of seminary life, in their need to keep a distance between themselves and others.

They go on to add a significant comment:

Forty-six of the clergy were diagnosed as personality disorders, suggesting the presence of lifelong patterns of maladjustment. These patterns of maladjustment must, therefore, in most cases have preceded the clerical state.

I think that we can at times provide inadequate and unhealthy models by which we hope to train young men for later life. There is no guarantee that doing things that are simply hard or unreasonable will even make us better equipped to do hard and unreasonable things in the future. Some psychological evidence seems to counter-indicate this. In the name of making men mature, we are deceiving ourselves if we think this can be accomplished by giving them immature things to do. I think this is sometimes illustrated in the way we try to develop responsibility in them. We give them very limited responsibilities and we may frequently be uneasy about giving them the trust and freedom they need to carry even these out successfully. Here again true growth will arise only through personal relationships. These should be very demanding, not the soft, mothering, and somewhat sickeningly over-protective postures that some few faculty members at times adopt. To be personal does not mean to be weak, and to be understanding does not mean to be so permissive that chaos is the result. It is not enough to make a man responsible for cleaning the hallway or making his bed. Neither is it enough to direct all his responsibility to ever more exact observance. But "observance" is often the thing that is emphasized. As one author wrote of this, "Not a few books on the seminary rule and in growth and spiritual perfection seem to delight in driving the soul to more and more precise observance; there is in them little sense of enlargement, wholesomeness, freedom, and love, such as one gets in reading the Gospels."

The models are frequently too intellectual and do not take into account the real unity of man who is one thing, a soul and body, intellect and emotions. He is told, over and over and over again, what are the things he must do and what ideals he should make his own. Yet these ideals are very intellectual and far too abstract. He is urged to examine his conscience but this is in a curiously cold and intellectual way that prevents him from seeing the roots of his behavior in his feeling self. He is told that he must know how to love people. This cannot be taught like geometry or English and it can only be learned through experience. He is told that he must be a

priest for all men but this is often rhetoric rather than reality. What he really has to do is experience some of these things, bump himself against real people, feel deeply the demands of life that can be so unsentimental and unforgiving. But things that are merely abstract do not appeal to the normal and healthy person; they are, however, just what the inadequate and abnormal feast upon. They love to dream, but, as Housman said, "The house of delusions is cheap to build but drafty to live in."

In the same way, a distortion of Teresian spirituality makes an unproductive life not only safe but sacred for the immature. Perhaps, after all, we have insisted a little too much that life is nothing but a succession of little things. So we read over and over again quotes like this one, "Holiness is not a matter of doing great things." But in this day and age we need men to address themselves to the *magna opera Domini*. We are not going to convert the world by spending all day looking for little scraps of paper to pick up off the floor and offer to God in secret. Such devotion has its place, but it probably is not a substitute for the fundamental business of being in the middle of the world, unafraid of its fierce competition and its cruel realities. We have made of the spiritual life a little world that each of us can generate like ectoplasm and in which we can live and move and have our being. Healthy people do not want to shut themselves off with their eyes cast downward and their thoughts turned inward and isolate themselves from the needs of suffering mankind. It is a sign of health that a man wants to do something with his life, that he wants to be somebody in the profound meaning of fulfilling his own personality. But at times we have even taught that to thwart these things is admirable and virtuous and that every desire to excel is to be suppressed. It is a curious reversal of the healthy striving that a normal person experiences in wanting to grow and go beyond himself and make the world different because he has passed through it. But the man who is afraid of the world, the man who cannot get out of himself because of neurotic shackles, he rather fancies this kind of spirituality which removed him from competition and sanctifies his weakness. He reminds one of the Mexican villager's greeting, "May God go with you and may nothing new ever happen to you."

You can all think of other examples, and I think many of you have felt very deeply the things I have been talking about. But many of you have probably felt guilty because you have felt these healthy and creative strivings. The creative man, to a certain extent, has been penalized in seminary training. We are just beginning to learn something about creativity in psychology, the healthy kind of creativity which is comparable in its potential to atomic energy.

There is a trend on the part of some right now to misunderstand the nature of the mature freedom that we must provide as the normal atmosphere for mature growth in our seminaries. Some have felt clearly the changing nature of the seminary population. This is a generation that asks questions, does not seem satisfied with some of our answers and strains for changes in everything. So some of us have been conservative, like the little old lady Barzun described as saying that "The modern thunderstorm no longer clears the air." But if there is one thing that is normal it is to change. (An amazing number of things are normal when you think about it for a while. It is normal, for example, to be imperfect.) Others have been the very opposite of conservative in facing this new generation. They have taken all the restrictions away and let the seminarians have anything they want. Neither of these viewpoints represents the mature kind

of making disciples that is so much needed. Freedom is not an easy thing to bear. Eric Fromm once wrote a book suggesting that some of us truly try to escape freedom because of the inevitable cross of responsibility that it places on our shoulders. But the normal person wants to be free just as he wants to meet the demands of responsibility, arduous though they may be. We cannot abandon our standards of excellence or our demands on the very best that our students have to offer. We cannot give them license in a chaotic world of their own making from which all adults have fled. That is something like the "teen-age tyranny" that has been written about recently. Freedom is a far different thing, and it is only truly understood by strong and mature men.

"Freedom," Camus says, "is not a reward of a decoration that is celebrated with champagne. Nor yet a gift, a box of dainties designed to make you lick your chops. Oh, no! It's a chore . . . and a long-distance race quite solitary and very exhausting. No champagne, no friends raising their glasses as they look at you affectionately. Alone in a forbidding room, alone in the prisoner's box before the judges, and alone to decide in face of oneself or in the face of others' judgments. At the end of all, freedom is a court sentence; that's why freedom is too heavy to bear, especially when you're down with a fever, are distressed, or love nobody."

Only mature men can love other men effectively, and this Pope Paul VI says is "the genius of the apostolate." Our young men cannot grow in a vacuum but will only grow through their inter-relationships with very strong and good normal priests. There is absolutely no substitute for this. Seminary education has got to be deeply personal or it is merely an elaborate game. There is no technique, no plan, nothing outside of ourselves that can answer the needs of seminary education in this day and age. *We* are the answer.

The world is not a sandbox full of playing children. We cannot send out anything less than a mature and manly generation of priests to minister to the human needs of men. St. Thomas, in writing of the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, says that we must burn with our own oil, that we cannot borrow our fuel from others, and that we had better have it when we need it. That is the light that is not meant to be under a bushel but on the mountain top to give light to a darkened world.

Not many miles from here there is a light flickering on a Virginia hillside to mark the grave of President Kennedy. He, like an older John who died only a few months before, captured the attention and following of hundreds of thousands of men. He gave courage and hope and strength. Can it be that his life and death have a meaning for us? Can it be that some of us, fussing with medieval minutia, do not seem very profound in the light of that graveside flame? Could we learn something from this man who, while we theorized endlessly about the role of a Catholic president, met its challenge and lived it out courageously? Perhaps there is something to learn from this man who, facing the Presidency, said, "I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it." Perhaps his healthy normality, and the fullness of the life that flowed from it—the life of a man who burned with his own oil—does, in fact, give us a fresh vision of the work of instructing disciples. It is far more a work of freeing the best that is in them than of getting control of them.

The healthier things are, the better. That is not a soft and empty world, but a profoundly challenging one in which men must keep their feet on the ground. It is a simple enough notion: If we are normal and healthy, if

we are mature enough to be real with our students, then they, too, will be healthy and normal and really mature.

Two familiar words catch the burden of our common concern. "Bishop" means *one who sees* and "Pastor" means *one who feeds*. So the most unbishop-like action is to be blind, to lack vision. And the most unpriestly action is to want to be fed rather than to feed.

These are two normal activities, seeing and feeding; there is something straightforward and uncomplicated about them. Healthy people do them unselfconsciously. Ours is the task to send out a kingly generation, a royal priesthood, with a clear vision of the world and its hungers and the strength to feed it generously.

Differentiated Seminary Discipline *

REV. PAUL F. D'ARCY, M.M.

*Director of Education, The Maryknoll Fathers,
Maryknoll, New York*

A HEALTHY CANDIDATE for the priesthood or religious life is one who is capable of growth—ready to develop. He responds to challenge. He is not security-oriented, looking for a niche where he can stay as is, without having to grow. The purpose of seminary training and discipline is to facilitate and maximize this growth—to provide an atmosphere for our candidates in which they can mature to become effective priests. An effective priest possesses deeply internalized values both religious and moral, is open to his experience, and is able to establish relationships with other men, broadly and deeply. The goal of seminary training is to prepare our men for this. Clearly a seminary's *raison d'être* is the maturing of the seminarians and not other considerations such as the convenience of the staff.

In my experience, there is a characteristic of those who are attracted to the priesthood and religious life which is very relevant for deciding on the kind of training which will facilitate their growth. This is not true of every individual, but it is true of a majority. They tend to be more unsure of themselves, less assertive than others. At the same time, they have highly sensitive consciences and have internalized the values of their parents and teachers. To put it succinctly: They have weak egos and strong superegos. They need a training which will strengthen their own self-trust, self-acceptance, and self-assertion. They are keenly alert to the expectations of others; they need to find and strengthen themselves. They have to discover their own identity. A system of training which places a premium on conformity to a pattern of regulations reinforces their already established personality structure, which is to meet a set of extrinsic norms rather than to develop their own inner sense of direction.

In a recent empirical study of character development,¹ Peck and Havighurst have delineated five types of character of different degrees of maturity, and they

* This paper was delivered at a joint session of the Major and Minor Seminary Departments.

¹ Peck and Havighurst, *The Psychology of Character Development*. Wiley, 1960.

have shown the relationship between these moral types and family influences and personality characteristics. The two least mature are the "amoral" and "expedient" types of individual who have no internalized moral values and who correspond respectively to an infantile and to an early childhood level of development in the moral sphere. Without going into detail, such individuals are frequently found in correctional institutions; seldom in seminaries. Two somewhat more mature types, corresponding to about the same level of development—that of later childhood—but which are otherwise quite dissimilar, are the "conforming" and the "irrational-conscientious" types. Both have internalized values. The irrational-conscientious have rigid, unmodifiable values which they follow, if necessary, against the opposition of the whole world; the conforming follow the expectations of the group among whom they live. The most mature stage of moral development is the "rational-altruistic," which corresponds to an adolescent and adult stage of development. Such individuals have internalized moral values which can be modified in terms of their experience.

A minority of individuals belong to the most mature type: a majority of society in general are probably of the conforming type. I believe that this is also true of a large proportion of religious vocations.

The authors show the de facto relationship between these types and four basic dimensions of family values and discipline. These are: (1) mutual trust and approval vs. distrust and disapproval; (2) consistency—inconsistency; (3) democracy—autocracy; (4) severity—leniency.

Moral maturity in the child is highly related to the degree of trust and approval he receives in the home as well as to the consistency of parental control. Taken by themselves, democratic family practices are only slightly related to maturity of moral behavior but when combined with consistency and trust have a systematically positive influence. Likewise, severity taken by itself has no significant relationship with moral maturity but in combination with other factors it has a negative effect.

Individuals of the rational-altruistic type come from very trustful, democratic families which are consistent but also lenient. The typical conforming person comes from a family which is regular in its rules and its way of life. It is authoritarian and rather severe. The conformer is not characterized by a strong self which is a characteristic of those capable of a more mature moral behavior.

The implication of this is, that if growing up in a family which is trustful, consistent, lenient, and democratic leads to moral maturity, the same should be true of seminary training. Before going on to differentiated discipline, it is important to have some notions of healthy discipline in general which will apply at any level of training.

A seminary, while often compared to a family, is basically a different type of structure and is more comparable to an organization or a bureaucracy. Unlike the family, it tends to get formalized, to become governed by a set of rules and regulations, and to become impersonal. It becomes efficient and orderly like a machine. This, however, is not what develops a person; a person develops by his contacts with other mature persons. In any organization there is also a tendency for rules to proliferate and then to become rigid and petrified, and in a religious bureaucracy to become, in addition, sanctified. These seem to be inherent drifts in organizations and one must always be aware of them and working to counteract them so that they do not dominate.

In addition to the rule, a basic aspect of discipline lies in the persons

exercising authority. As we have seen, the best results occur when they are consistent, trustful and accepting, democratic and lenient. In any discussion of discipline, the question of training for obedience in later life is bound to rise. We want our candidates to mature to where they will be able to live and work effectively with their pastors. This is a relationship problem, not solved or prepared for merely by a discipline of rules. This is why relationships between seminarians and the priests on the staff are so important. While a seminary is not being run for the convenience of the faculty, neither is it to be an adolescent or young adult tyranny either. It is not a mutual manipulation by two opposing forces. This does not lead to maturity.

Effective training and discipline is not a one-man job. It is the work of an entire staff. The program of training needs concerted faculty support and relative harmony of outlook. Otherwise, there can be inconsistency of a glaring sort among the staff members themselves, or the rector can get caught so far ahead or behind that he is out on a limb without the support of his staff. Perhaps a rector's main work is with his staff to help them work more cooperatively with each other and with the students.

We do not want seminary discipline which is over-protective. An over-protective program of training has rules and procedures to eliminate all conflict between individuals, even down to whether a window is open too little or too far. It also can be over-protective by working out the distribution of the seminarian's time and effort. This is one of man's great personal responsibilities. A basic part of one's maturing is learning how to balance studies with apostolate, work and recreation, sociability with one's other responsibilities, prayer and work, sleep and activity, and many other polarities. We cannot rely on scheduling and rules to teach a person how to do this for himself in later life.

Since a seminarian is growing in the seminary, this means he is learning to cope with the problems of life in a way appropriate for his age. As he masters one dimension, he is ready to move on to another. Obviously, there must be a differentiated program of discipline to keep up with the growing candidate. And certainly this does not mean that the discipline becomes more reasonable as the candidate progresses for it should always be reasonable. It is rather that the system of discipline must keep pace with the candidate's growth.

Some say that the seminary should be easiest for those entering and become tougher as the years go on. I agree, if by more difficult is not meant more frustrating but rather the very real and challenging burdens of increasing freedom and responsibility.

I would now like to spell out some principles of differential discipline. This is an emerging area for exploration. There are no established guidelines—the whole problem needs thought and experimentation and exchange of experiences. I am sure that great changes lie ahead in this area of seminary training.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF DIFFERENTIAL DISCIPLINE

1. *Differentiation.*—The seminary not only need not but ought not be governed by the same rules at the various levels of training, which range from first-year high school through post-college professional education. Such differentiation of discipline does, as a matter of fact, occur where the levels are conducted at separate institutions in different localities. However, even within an institution there is no major reason why there cannot be differentiated discipline. This is commonplace within a family where the sixteen-year-old son has different privileges than the fourteen-

year-old. Furthermore, it is not necessary that there be a compulsory mass movement of every individual to every activity of a general sort, such as lectures and even religious exercises.

2. *Supervision.*—There should be initial supervision at each new growth phase, diminishing as the new step is assimilated and mastered. Supervision will thus occur at all levels, but not for the same things. It will not be something which is present only in the minor seminary but not in the major seminary. Supervised study is appropriate at the lower levels of training. Supervision of catechetics and apostolic work is very appropriate in the opening stage of these activities at the major seminary level. Once a stage has been largely mastered by the group, there is no need for further supervision. Reasonable performance is now expected.
3. *Emphasis on goals.*—As the seminarian matures, there should be a growing emphasis that he achieve certain goals, but without the means being dictated. He should be left free as to the means. This is a discipline of objectives without a regimentation of means. We can easily demand the means and lose the end.
4. *Regimentation.*—This should progressively decrease. Many things that have to be spelled out for the adolescent, any civilized adult should be aware of without the need for a rule. If there is a need for correction, the individual can be reproached for not being civilized rather than for breaking the seminary rule. The rule should contain only what is necessary for order.
5. *Responsibility.*—As the seminarian advances, there should be an increase in opportunities for genuine responsibility for the welfare of others such as is found in apostolic work in which one's effectiveness makes a real difference in the life of another. Also, there should be an increase in responsibility for the management of one's own life. Both presume the possibility of actual failure. This is not as orderly or safe as a neat protective system of discipline.
6. *Contact with the world.*—There should be an increasing opportunity for outside contact. The student has come from the world and will be going back to change it. This includes opportunities for lectures to be attended away from the seminary, workshops, conventions, visiting libraries to do research, apostolic work, and even entertainment. Since seminaries are often far from centers of population the students need ready means of transportation to make this actually as well as theoretically possible.
7. *Counseling.*—To help the student with this process of growth there is a need for competent personal counseling. The seminarian needs help to balance out his life from the inside. For those who flounder under the pressure of freedom and responsibility and who get caught in a rut, there should be provisions to reach them before they get hurt too badly. The time to help with these adjustments is while these men are still in the seminary rather than after ordination when the opportunities for help are less. Mature priests, with training and skills in personal counseling and who make themselves available to the students, play a vital role in any program of increased freedom and responsibility. They help the individual to make the transition from an external discipline to an inner order.

8. *Practices in one's own society as a norm.*—The question arises as to how far to go in modifications of traditional discipline. One basic principle of normality is to follow what is considered normal in other healthy and parallel portions of our society.

- a) What freedom and responsibility is normally granted to those of his age outside the seminary? At eighteen he can go overseas to fight for his country; at twenty-one he is an adult, can vote, assume financial obligations, and marry without consent of parents.
- b) What is the practice in educational institutions of a comparable level? High schools have a student council; colleges have special restrictions for freshmen and increasing privileges for upperclassmen; students at the professional level of education are treated as adults, given great freedom but are expected to produce.
- c) Practices which are being questioned both in the Church and in society at large are worth questioning in their seminary applications. The value of silence gives way to conversation in the Cursillos and the retreats of the Better World Movement. Schools are questioning the wisdom of compulsory attendance at religious exercises.
- d) Regulations can be modified in terms of new technical developments. The telephone, the typewriter, the transistor radio, television, automatic dispensers, magazines and papers are ordinary everyday taken-for-granted parts of our culture.

It is axiomatic to students of culture that if you tamper with one part of a culture, you may upset the balance and trouble will pop up elsewhere. The same holds for changes in seminary culture. As soon as changes are made in discipline, the balance shifts and we can expect complications to arise in other quarters. We have to know our goals and keep our eyes on the situation. If we are open and patient, we will be in a position to make the additional adjustments which will continue to be needed. We, ourselves, and our seminaries will be growing in pace with our candidates.

The Aggiornamento of Seminaries

REV. PETER RIGA

Diocese of Buffalo, New York

IN ONE OF HIS DISCOURSES at the Second Vatican Council, Archbishop Hurley of Durham, South Africa, made the following remarkable statement: "It will be impossible to have any renovation in the Church unless we first reform our seminaries." I most heartily agree. The lay apostolate, the liturgy, Catholic Social Action, ecumenism, family spirituality, et cetera, will all go for naught if we cannot imbue our future priests with the enthusiasm of the great changes and revolutions—both spiritual and secular—of our times. We are living in exciting times for the Church. We have already launched into an unprecedented, intelligent appreciation of and participation in the liturgy. The desire for unity of the Christian community has never been so

strong or so well encouraged as in what is known as the ecumenical movement. A deeper knowledge and appreciation of the Sacred Scriptures has immensely contributed to our spiritual lives. These movements, I would say, are renovations within the structure of the Church, both in its strict interpretation as the Catholic Church and, more broadly, the entire Christian Community.

There is another dimension of the Church which needs rethinking in our day—especially as regards its position in the seminary curriculum. It is the dimension of the Church's relationship to the secular world, of her witness therein. Since Leo XIII (*Rerum novarum*) up to and including Pope John's two earthshaking documents, *Mater et Magistra* and *Pacem in terris*, the Church has developed fully a whole new dimension to her being: the corpus of social thought. In our seminaries, we have treated this corpus as something added on to the regular courses of dogma, moral theology, Scripture, et cetera. This, of course, is not only to lessen its importance, but it fundamentally distorts the incarnational mission of the Church. Dogma and social principles are not two disciplines which exist alongside of each other. On the contrary, they are two sides of the same coin. Worship of God and service of the brethren are what makes Christianity what it is.

Thus, liturgy, which is nothing more than dogma prayed, in the phrase of Vatican II, can never be a simple ritual of repeated phrases and readings, but must be viewed as it is: that is, as radically oriented toward daily life. There can never be any disjunction of the two. They are two sides of the same coin of worship, of the Christian life lived in Christ. The Christian's life and practice is a test to see if he has really grasped what God has told him in the liturgical assembly. His life is a continuation of the liturgy, a continuous offering, a sort of prolonged and vital liturgy. We all know very well that worship has within it elements of adoration, gratitude, contrition, and petition; but what the Christian community does not seem to understand to any significant degree is that worship is also a school for fraternal service. The ancient Greek word expressed this very well: *Koinonia* (Communion) is translated as "Communion with the Lord" in the liturgical assembly but also as "service of the brethren," which is only the natural outcome of our mutual commitment to and love of Christ and in Him, to each other as true brothers. The great commandments of love of God and of neighbor are indivisible, and worship is the bond which makes them one. The New Testament word for love (*agape*) is used indiscriminately for both God and man. The Church worships in order to prepare men for God, so that, in turn, she may also prepare men for the service of man. The dialogue in the liturgical assembly must not, cannot, go on apart from neighbor and the notion of service. Such a dichotomized view of Christianity is a monstrosity—a monstrosity which goes on today in spite of the frequentation of the sacraments. In a sense, this is the great tragedy of modern Catholicism: Too long have we separated worship from the service of the brothers, from our fellowman, without regard to race, color, or creed. The "good" nineteenth century Catholic liberals (today: conservatives) practiced their religion well insofar as sacramental frequentation was concerned, and the service of social and economic justice for the brethren wasn't even considered a part of "worship." The same can be said today of our South American neighbors. The few rich (*all*, almost without exception) frequent the sacraments weekly but obstinately refuse any service of the brethren in just, gradual taxation, agrarian reform, investment of capital at home instead of Switzerland and Wall Street.

Nor must we look across our borders for such a dichotomy. The race problem in the United States is a classical example. How very, very many

Catholic racists do we have at our Communion rails each Sunday—and a few possibly in our pulpits. This is merely one example among many others in which the Catholic consciousness is almost oblivious to the problems and agonies of our fellowmen. The aged, the forty-odd million poor of the "other America," do not seem to cause our consciences much trouble either in the liturgical community or elsewhere. The situation is very serious, for unless the lived practice of the layman reflects the dynamic love and life of the liturgy, he is living either a conscious or an unconscious lie. This type of (mostly unconscious) hypocrisy is a very bad apologetic for the Church no matter how many proofs we have for God's existence or excavations under St. Peter's to prove that Peter was at Rome in the year 60 A.D.

If worship becomes dichotomized from the notion of service, we are saying that it is possible to go to God as beings disembodied from the body of mankind, somehow denatured from the common nature which we inseparably share with Christ and with our brothers who are all men. The mute and individual worshipper who does not realize this Christian and human solidarity and, therefore, responsibility, who busily promotes his private bartering with God, is a contradiction in terms. This idea of worship is riven through with both bad psychology and bad Christian spirituality. It is compromising to both God's grace and social action for our brothers. It is a trait too often found among Catholics and, possibly, this explains their absence in the civil rights movements, the U.N., and in public life in general. "What has all this to do with religion" they say, and they are quite serious. They can see no correlation between doctrine and social action and service.

This vital unity of doctrine and social justice as the concrete application of doctrine in practical life cannot be overemphasized in the training of future priests. It cannot be relegated to a course or two in first or second theology; it must be spread throughout the seminary course, for our effect on the modern world will radically depend on whether we can meaningfully apply the social teachings of the Church to the world. In this corpus of social thought, the Church speaks the language of modern man, becomes involved in his problems and agonies. If this is not done, we can forget about *aggiornamento* of the Church in the modern world. Seminaries will continue to be what they have been for the last hundred years ever since the social revolution of modern man began: quaint institutions, anachronistic in our society, and producing men about as fit to deal with the vital social-moral problems of modern man as I am to repair a cyclotron. As the emphasis of study and orientation of seminary training is today, its roots come to us from a distant age and a vanished culture. I cannot overemphasize the vital importance of stressing the whole corpus of the Church's social thought; the seminarians' minds must be as totally imbued with it as they are with their scholastic theology, because on this will depend whether we shall have anything meaningful to tell the world or whether we shall continue spouting our irrelevant "natural law theories" to a world which neither understands us nor is in any way attracted to us by what we have to say.

The liturgy "makes the Christian" (to use the phrase of the ninth century French ritual), gives him his identification both with regard to his celestial calling and his earthly commitment to the city of man. In reality, the worship of God and the service of man are two sides of the same coin of worship. To emphasize one at the cost of the other is to destroy the Christian message of the good news of salvation. One cannot separate liturgical worship from social action for the two together spell the Christian's total commitment. If we emphasize one at the cost of the other we have transcendentalism,

which has been characteristic of the Catholicism of the past four hundred years (as well as of Eastern Orthodox Christianity period after Christianity). John XXIII put an end, at least in theory, to this Catholic ghetto mentality which had been prevalent since the Reformation. The concept of Church as an armed fortress fighting off the onslaughts of the enemy is a thing of the past. As Péguy once remarked, the reason why many Catholics do not have dirty hands is because they have no hands. The concomitant complement to the liturgy is social action; both together are the fullness of Christian action and commitment. On the other hand, if we stress social action and justice without the liturgy we have a type of terrestrial messianism similar to that of Marxism. To tell the truth, this is the great temptation of the economically and technically growing world and most of the blame must be placed on Christians who have been satisfied to go to Mass and receive the sacraments without realizing the fraternal love in social action as a natural concomitant to liturgical worship.

There can be no living nor authentic faith in God without "works of faith"; and among these, there is first of all that of caring for others "without distinction of persons": "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Matt. 22:37,39). To love the neighbor as oneself is not confined to satisfying, by means of Catholic charities, the most urgent necessities of our neighbor. It means also, and above all, effectively to desire for him what we desire for ourselves such as civil rights, health, education, development, civilization, and culture; it means to wage an effective war for him against the evils which we fight for our own advantage; to do our best to eliminate the great economic and social inequalities and the oppression of man by man. Unless priests get across this social message to their people as part and parcel of the Christian message, then we can simply forget about any meaningful *aggiornamento*. To be a Christian is not purely to serve God, but it is also a dynamic social ethic, a service to mankind; it is not merely a theology but also an anthropology. And although Christianity is directed to the "beyond," it, nevertheless, must influence our actions in fostering science and promoting civilization "here below." We must somehow get across to our students and people that our belief in God may never become a flight from the world and from the history of mankind; it must, on the contrary, give a deeper meaning to our bond with the world and with history. Solidarity with the agonies and problems of modern man becomes the sacrament of God's saving presence in the midst of the world: "I was naked and you clothed Me . . . I was in prison and you came to Me" (Matt. 25:36).

The widespread representation of Christianity as the antagonist of the Communist social system, or even of the social organization of society, is very dangerous. It creates the impression that the Christian faith is primarily a negative and conservative force in social matters, that it is the strongest bulwark of the capitalist concept of society and the distribution of wealth. Christianity thereby loses almost all of its creative value of the social revolution in her own doctrines.

This is unfortunate, even tragic, since the social teachings of the Church can revolutionize the world, can make the Church meaningful to modern man and his problems. She can vitally contribute to the reorganization of today's world. Yet this force can be effectively applied only when Christianity pays heed to the true causes of the social disease and fights the evil in its roots. Communism is not the ultimate source of today's crisis, but the crying economic and social inequalities and enslavement in which so many millions of the world's peoples are involved. Communion claims to have the answer in

an anthropology all of its own. The question, therefore, is: How can Christianity foster social justice in the world of today? Can it make its own Christian anthropology relevant for modern man? The answer to this question lies squarely on the training in the Church; the social teaching which we will give students in our seminaries.

It is perhaps too easy to criticize a seminary system, and where the Church is concerned there is an added danger: We may either see her in a too-human aspect ("incarnationalism") or falsify her nature by taking into account only her divine origin and continuation in history (transcendentalism). In either case, we see only what we want to see and not the total vision of faith of what the Church really is. She is always Holy in her origin, her doctrine, her saints, throughout the course of human history; but she is also, here on earth, the *ecclesia semper reformanda*, the Church of sinners, of those who continuously need that conversion (the New Testament *metanoia*) of heart. To emphasize one at the cost of the other is to commit the greatest sin of the Christian economy: to deny her incarnationalism, her *divino-humano* existence among sinful and miserable men. The Church is in the same economy of salvation of the Word incarnate, Who took upon Himself absolutely everything that we sinful men are and have, except sin. He was scandal enough for, in the final analysis, the criteria of both Christ and His Church are not, can not be, the criteria of a human person or a human organization. In this, they occupy the same sphere of human scandal: "The Jews demand miracles and the Greeks look for wisdom. But we, for our part, preach a crucified Christ . . . Who is the power of God and the wisdom of God" (I Cor. 1:22-24). Thus our confusion when we come to measure Christ and His Church in human categories. St. John depicts Christ's *triumph* when He is crucified on the Cross (the Greek word which St. John uses when speaking of the crucifixion means "glorification"). The Christian's real triumph is when he is dissolved and one with Christ (Phil. 1:23). He is most like Christ when he suffers (Gal. 2: 20-21) here below, there is such a bond of union between Christ and the poor and despised of this earth (Matt. 25:35); that they are his choicest friends and companions because they are the most despised (Matt. 9:11).

This is the logic of the Gospel. Have we, Catholics as a group, really taken seriously this logic of the Gospels? Oh, yes, we have always had our examples of heroic poverty in our midst: the many religious orders and others who have taken the vow. But it is strange that when the Gospels speak of the poor, the despised and the neglected, the message is for all the followers of Christ. We have simply not taken the Gospel seriously on this point and yet it is clear for all to read. We have followed the scholastic moralists in distinguishing "heroic" poverty from the "ordinary" demands of ordinary Christians. The religious would practice the former and the rest of the faithful could ride along on the Christian life with considerably less. In practice, this has come to mean that poverty is something foreign to the layman and diocesan priest. The idea would be comforting if it did not contradict the Gospel. Every Christian by his very profession must practice poverty, and what he has must be used in such a way as to best aid his brothers. Only in this context can riches make any sense for the Christian. But we have gone merrily on our way with a type of bourgeois Christianity which is very characteristic of American Catholics. "The good life" is part and parcel of American (and ipso facto, I take it) Catholic thinking. We have managed to "baptize" this as much as possible; we have "opiumized" our consciousness by

various charity appeals, support of schools and institutions, with the result that the Catholic consciousness in the United States can rest pretty easy ("We are a generous Church") in the midst of forty million people of poverty of the other America and where over half of the world's people go to bed hungry every night. How did we get to this point? Our pulpits have helped "opiumize" their congregations by making them believe that if they "support" their Church and various other charity appeals, they are good Catholics. The poverty of the Gospels is not even discussed from these pulpits under fear of "fanaticism" of those who would take the Gospel too seriously. Those who wish to remain lukewarm ought never to read the Gospels; and if they do, do so under the manifold distinction of the sixteenth and seventeenth century moralists who have managed to make Christ say something other than that of our written pages in the Gospels.

And what of our association with the poor and despised in accordance with the Gospel's logic? In conformity to these social teachings of the Church? Here, indeed, speaks the wisdom of the world in Catholicism's midst. We can not discuss here the utter failure of so-called conservative-type Catholics to respond in any meaningful way to this essential phase of Gospel teaching. It is enough to mention the failure of Catholics in any great number to meet the challenge of the race problem in the United States. We are beginning to wake up, but only after the Negro himself has forced us to take stock of our own Christian teachings and its connotations for race. To be associated with the poor? Catholicism's answer to sane urban renewal was and is a massive exodus to the suburbs and the "good life" while leaving those stinking and squalid poor in their own blighted neighborhoods. Get out as soon as you can especially if a Negro moves into the neighborhood. Panic and run; don't stay to suffer and work and be identified with the poorest of humanity. Thank God for a few exceptions in our midst. The theme of the chosen few of the Bible (the *anawim*), who were to suffer and thereby save the many, is here dramatically relived in the Church of today, U.S.A.

Another point is that of the International Community. While Pius XII spoke frequently and favorably about the United Nations and its objectives, Pope John in *Peace on Earth* made explicit reference to the United Nations as a positive embodiment of his ideal of the international authority of the International Community. American Catholics seem to manifest a massive reluctance to endorse any form of internationalism which requires the smallest surrender of American sovereignty. The American Catholic community was never in full sympathy with this side of Pope Pius' and Pope John's thought, and it has even failed in general to become acquainted with it. This encyclical of Pope John will serve as a clear and authoritative rebuke to the numerous Catholics who have not relinquished this false notion of exaggerated nationalism, and thus have failed to appreciate the mind of the Holy See on this highly important issue. In the words of Pope Pius VI: "How many Catholics continue to shut themselves within the narrow confines of a chauvinistic nationalism incompatible with the courageous efforts to start a world community demanded by the Popes?"

Let me say that I do not blame these Catholics. They have been the recipients of a notion of religion which was restricted to sacramentalism and ritual without a dynamic orientation of liturgy and doctrine to applied Christianity, social Christianity. The real cause is the medieval outlook of seminaries on the social revolutions of our day.

But the liturgy, the announcing in word and act of the good news (gospel) and communication of Christ's saving Pascal mystery would be an evisce-

rated liturgy, an eviscerated Christianity without authentic fruit if it does not aim at a spiritual offering and a lived gospel, to and for charity among all men, the conversion of the world, and the consecration of the whole world and its activities to Christ. Laymen, members of God's people of full right, who have participated in the sacred mystery and who have centered their lives with Christ, dead and resurrected, at Mass, are the same members who must put the Holy Sacrifice at the center of their lives in the world, among men. They are Christ's true envoys, His ambassadors; they are the spiritual prolongation of Christ's saving liturgical mystery in the midst of their brothers in the world. In virtue of this saving liturgical mystery, they must render this earth more inhabitable, more humane, more just, where so many poor await the bread of each day from their celestial and common Father in heaven.

Strange as this may seem, since the Reformation and Renaissance Catholicism has, for the most part, become shut into its own type of ghettoism and chauvinism. In part, this was understandable because of the counter-reaction to the Reform. There is something more fundamental here: a medieval concept of the Church in the world where we have all the right answers, and where all those outside the fold are not only heretics *theologice* but to be avoided as contaminating the deposits of faith, *civilliter*. This, of course, only culminated in the manifold difficulties with the birth of modern positive science—cf. Galileo affair which has continued to our own day with the case of Father Teilhard de Chardin whose books have been banned from all seminary libraries. All of the modern social revolutions have been conceived outside of the Church and sometimes in opposition to her. Democracy, religious liberty, the social revolution, psychological revolution, the scientific revolution, woman's suffrage, and, finally, the slave problem and civil rights. The charge is grave but can be amply substantiated. The problem for the modern Catholic is to enter into each of these fields and reap what is good and fine in them and bring the light of charity and faith to bear on them. A new age, the Johannine era, is upon us for the future and it promises such magnificent spiritual fruits that one dare not at this moment try to enumerate them. Pope John fully recognized this problem in his magnificent and revolutionary encyclical *Peace on Earth*:

151. It is no less clear that today, in traditionally Christian nations, secular institutions, although demonstrating a high degree of scientific and technical perfection and efficiency in achieving their respective ends, not infrequently are but slightly affected by Christian motivation or inspiration.

152. It is beyond question that in the creation of those institutions many contributed and continue to contribute who were believed to be and who consider themselves Christians; and without doubt, in part at least, they were and are. How does one explain this? It is our opinion that the explanation is to be found in an inconsistency in their minds between religious belief and their action in the temporal sphere. It is necessary, therefore, that their interior unity be re-established, and that in their temporal activity faith should be present as a beacon to give light, and charity as a force to give life."

Both this encyclical and *Mater et Magistra* must be read to see all the social connotations which flow from the direct profession of the Christian faith. For the social teaching of the Church is not a sort of afterthought of the body of Christian doctrine; on the contrary, it is the living, vital, and dynamic embodiment of Christian teaching of the basic and human problems

here below. General teachings are of little value unless they are brought to bear on the agonizing problems of real men in a real world in the course of human history. When the Church attempts to do this, she immediately becomes relevant to man's problems and *ipso facto* repugnant to many of our Catholics who have conceived of the Church and religion as an ivory tower—"sweet Jesus and me"—aspect of the divine life. In such a context it is not surprising to find many of even our educated Catholics calling the encyclical *Mater et Magistra* a "venture in triviality." The natural reaction to the Church when she attempts to make Christ's teaching relevant and meaningful to modern man through her social teaching is one of disbelief and dismay. What has the Sermon on the Mount to do with civil rights, urban renewal, nuclear disarmament, the U.N., the economic society, immigration, internal law, peace movements, racism, nationalism and internationalism? The answer is simple: Everything: for the Church's teachings on these aspects is her vital lifeline for the salvation of men of *this* world, at *this* time. To misunderstand the social teaching of the Church is to misunderstand the very nature of Christianity, which is characteristic, in a strange analogy, of both right-wing and conservative Catholics and various Pentecostal and fundamentalist Protestant sects. Both of these branches of Christianity must be rejected as being disincarnated from the problems, sweat and tears of men of our time. They are simply irrelevant and non-Christian. The great and genuine inheritors of true Christianity—Catholicism and to a lesser but true sense, Orthodox and Protestant Christianity—must reject them both as infections of the body of the Church.

My conclusion is simple. Unless we get our seminaries to become involved with these vital social problems—this applied Christianity, if you will—then we shall have lost not only the greatest single apologetic for our time, but we shall have remained in the entrenched status quo and ghettoism from which the modern popes have been desperately trying to draw us. In the words of the American bishops, let us act before "it is too late."

• PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS

Major Seminary Department: Minutes

First Session—Tuesday, March 31, 1964, 2, P.M., Atlantic City, New Jersey

THE MEETING was called to order at 2 P.M. by the president, Rev. Thomas W. Coyle, C.S.S.R., of Immaculate Conception Seminary, Oconomowoc, Wisconsin. The following were appointed to serve on the Committee on Nominations: Very Rev. John Danagher, C.M., *Chairman*; Rev. J. R. Sullivan, and Rev. Thomas Smith.

The first paper was delivered by Rev. Andrew Greeley on the topic: "The Contribution the Behavioral Sciences Can Make in Seminary Training."

In the discussion which followed, Father Greeley stated that his paper was concerned with proposing an ideal program and not with criticizing existing programs; one of his main purposes was to emphasize that a study of genuine sociological research is much superior to a textbook approach. The value of the insights of management-theory in the training of priest-

administrators was pointed out; training in canon law is not enough since future ecclesiastical officials should be professionally trained in administration as are future business executives.

In reply to a question as to whether a liberal arts type of sociology course would serve the pastoral objectives of the seminary, Father Greeley replied in the affirmative. Liberal arts type courses should develop a taste for reading, and a course based on research instead of a textbook would favor a pastoral orientation. The program outlined is not sufficient for future specialists: these should get specialized training in sociology in the field in which they will work. The liberal arts type courses would favor open-mindedness and readiness to learn, characteristics which are necessary for effective pastoral work.

Father Greeley, in responding to a question as to whether the isolation of the religious seminary from the world was bad sociologically, gave as his personal opinion that it resulted in taking a man out of his culture at a time when he was best able to understand it, and yet expected him to be able to understand the world later in order to work in it. The isolation of seminarians from the Catholic student body in general is a disadvantage for Catholic education.

One participant in the discussion thought that there was too much concern about active work for seminarians. He pointed out that St. Paul himself retired for three years before beginning his apostolate. There is a danger that too much activity will harm spiritual formation which needs at least two or three years of intensive work. There should be more attention to guiding the activity of the first year of the priesthood. Father Greeley replied by saying that involvement in social action is no substitute for academic training, that such involvement without intellectual formation can lead to narrow-mindedness. However, he pointed out that his paper was concerned with academic formation in sociology rather than with social activity in the seminary.

The second paper was given by Rev. Benedict W. Ashley, O.P., on the topic: "Modern Science and the Relevance of Scholastic Philosophy."

In reply to a question concerning the difficulty of finding time for the extra courses proposed, Father Ashley pointed out that his program envisaged, at most, 12 semester hours of integrated science and philosophy of nature, and that this is only 3 hours more than the minimal program in most seminaries.

Attention was called to the fact that the mentality of graduates of technical institutes differs from that of seminarians, and Father Ashley was asked how this gap could be bridged. He replied that the seminarians' studies should begin with the world view of modern science, at least descriptively. This is the picture underlying the mentality of technical students. Only then should philosophy be begun, starting with the philosophical problems raised by this world picture. Some of these problems can be answered, and will provide the foundation for further philosophical development, culminating in metaphysics. The starting point of philosophy has to be the world as we now know it. On the subject of the integration of other college courses with philosophy, Father Ashley suggested that courses in literature and modes of expression should be related to logic, and courses in the social sciences to ethics.

The problem of the relationship between science and Thomism was raised. It was pointed out that Chardin's evolutionary principle can be appreciated

by scientists, and the question was asked concerning the existence of a philosophical principle in Thomism which could bridge the gap between science, philosophy and theology. Father Ashley replied that according to the popes, Thomism can look at the facts of science and make them more intelligible than any other philosophical system can. Either the popes were wrong or philosophers are not doing their work well. The latter seems to be the case. The mistake consists in distinguishing too radically between science and philosophy, and in attempting to construct a philosophy in isolation from science. For example, evolution should be explained as the development of reality from an indeterminate "stuff," under the influence of the first cause, and not be considered as irrelevant to philosophy.

To the question as to whether Thomism rejects the facts of science which do not fit its theory, Father Ashley stated that, on the contrary, it begins with the facts of science. We now have a greater store of facts than did St. Thomas; hence his philosophy needs to be expanded to cope with these facts. There is a distinction between the facts of science and the world picture which science uses in interpreting its facts. Philosophy should be critical of this second aspect of science; it should be as observant of the facts as is the scientist himself. The seminary courses must limit themselves to giving the results of the sciences; that is all there is time for.

To the problem of harmonizing scientific terminology and the scholastic terminology based on Aristotelian physics, Father Ashley indicated that instructors need training both in science and philosophy. They can then show how the concepts of modern science still find their ultimate intelligibility in the Thomistic concepts of potency and act. One of the participants observed that this result could also be achieved by team teaching.

Asked about the possibility of coming to metaphysics from the data of other sciences, Father Ashley replied that, pedagogically speaking, some students might find it easier to start with the social sciences, but that the scientific elaboration of metaphysics requires the philosophy of nature which in turn rests on the natural sciences as a foundation.

The lack of contact between Thomistic psychologists and secular ones was pointed out and the question as to how to establish contact was proposed. Father Ashley stated that the best way is to start with the picture of man of empirical psychology and then criticize it in terms of what it doesn't account for. For instance, the empirical theory of learning is based almost exclusively on experimentation with rats; this is not adequate to explain human learning.

The meeting ended at 4 P.M.

The Executive Committee meeting of the Major Seminary Department followed on the conclusion of the first session. Present were: Rev. Thomas W. Coyle, C.S.S.R.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Riley; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frank M. Schneider; Very Rev. Msgr. John E. Murphy; Very Rev. James A. Laubacher, S.S., and Rev. Conrad Falk, O.S.B. The Department's need for an associate secretary was discussed, and continued efforts to find a suitable candidate for the position were urged. The president declared his intention of appointing the Committee on Accreditation called for in the bylaws, within the next few months. It was decided to recommend to the General Executive Board that at future meetings a full day be set aside for joint meetings of the Major and Minor Seminary Departments, in which the program would provide separate meetings for a high school division, a college division and a theology division.

Second Session—Wednesday, April 1, 10:30 A.M.

The meeting was called to order by Father Coyle at 10:30 A.M., and he called on Rev. Walter Burghardt, S.J., for his paper on the topic: "The Intellectual Formation of the Future Priest."

In the discussion which followed, Father Burghardt was asked how far the ideas he proposed in his paper had been realized in his own seminary. He replied that they were in a period of transition. The atmosphere of intellectual challenge was good, and the substance of the curriculum is in process of change by faculty committees assisted by student committees. The initiative came from the students. The danger of thinking that everything old is worthless is counteracted by communication, which usually brings extremists to a more moderate position. The contact between students and faculty and students and administration is good.

In response to a question concerning communication between faculty members, Father Burghardt said that omission of this point from the paper was unintentional. He thought it was more important in the seminary than in other educational institutions because of the greater unity of philosophical and theological subjects.

Asked how the proposed curriculum fitted in with the objectives of the seminary in training priests, Father Burghardt touched on the difficulty in formulating the aims and objectives of a seminary. For instance: What is the relation between a teaching career and the priesthood? One answer is: Christian witness in profane fields. But why can this not be done by laymen? This difficulty is not so acute in a diocesan seminary, but is still present. The intellectual life should permeate pastoral activity, liturgy, counseling, preaching. The relationship between the priesthood and a career in secular learning needs much more discussion.

A participant in the discussion inquired how the proposed program had affected number of class hours, the lecture method of teaching, and study periods. Father Burghardt said that there has been no general abandonment of lectures; some teachers have substituted discussion periods for some of their lecture periods. Each professor is free to use his time according to his own tastes and talents. Students soon realize that they must work hard in order to have profitable discussions. The general adoption of the discussion method would have to result in a revision of present examination procedures, which are at present geared to the lecture method. With regard to other disciplinary modifications, this will depend on the character of the student body; more flexibility is possible in seminaries with more mature students.

To an inquiry about students of below-average intellectual ability, Father Burghardt did not rule out the possibility of their being ordained for some dioceses. However, such cases will be the exception, and such students should have prudence and an awareness of their own limitations. There should be compensating qualities, particularly in their spiritual life, since there is a danger that as they grow older, their spiritual life will deteriorate for lack of intellectual nourishment.

The meeting was adjourned at noon.

Third Session—Thursday, April 2, 10 A.M.

The third session was a joint meeting with the Minor Seminary Department. Father Coyle, president of the Major Seminary Department, presided, and introduced the speakers, Rev. Eugene C. Kennedy, M.M., and Rev.

Paul M. D'Arcy, M.M., who spoke on the topic, "Differentiated Seminary Discipline." Discussion was opened after both speakers had presented their papers.

Father Kennedy was asked for suggestions about ascetical literature incorporating the principles developed in the presentations. He was reluctant to recommend anything other than the New Testament, since books do not tell how to develop people ascetically, and need to be used always with reference to particular situations.

The question of how far differentiation can go in the minor seminary, with particular reference to apostolic work, was proposed to Father D'Arcy. In response, he asked the members of the audience to relate their experience in experimenting with apostolic work for high school seminarians. The representative of a day school reported that their fourth-year students go to visit hospitals, do tutoring in Negro parishes in catechism and elementary subjects. The program of hospital visits has been going on for six years, the tutoring for one year. The students profit from a sense of accomplishment and an understanding of Negro problems. In another day school, the fourth-year students work in playgrounds; the work is volunteer with no rewards; it develops a sense of altruism.

In a boarding school, the juniors and seniors act as counselors to youth groups, do ecumenical work in explaining the Mass to Protestant youth groups. The growth in maturity consequent on these activities is very visible. The college students in this institution teach in regular catechetical programs on Saturdays, after taking CCD training. This, too, proved very profitable. Another boarding school reported that its fourth-year students teach catechism and hold weekly discussions on their work. They also visit homes for the aged and engage in some ecumenical work as guides.

Father Kennedy was asked for his views on universal psychological testing for seminarians. He expressed his belief in the value of such tests, but saw no possibility of a universal use of them. He recommended their use on an individual and personal basis, because of the tendency of mass tests to depersonalize. He emphasized that the evaluation of individual candidates is demanding and taxing. The different aims of the various seminaries and religious orders also militate against universal testing. The use of psychological testing to distinguish normal from abnormal candidates is really unnecessary. In response to a question of the criterion of healthy normality, Father Kennedy cautioned against regarding the fads of adolescents as signs of abnormality or as symptoms of a universal neuroticism.

Father D'Arcy was asked to comment on seminaries where professors and staff are not allowed to mingle with the seminarians. He stated that seminarians develop most by contact with the priest teachers of the seminary—mature adults who take the place of their parents—and that growth takes place in their presence. To be effective these men should be genuine, aware of themselves; they should manifest their acceptance of the students without conditions, that is, they should genuinely like and understand them. To this, a member of the audience added the observation that in seminaries run by religious orders for the training of diocesan priests, there should be continued contact of the seminarians with parish priests as well as with the religious who are the teachers and administrators.

Another member of the audience observed that he went to a strict and rigid seminary and now teaches in a seminary where there are many opportunities for freedom. In view of the fact that the first seminary seemed to have produced more outward-going and zealous priests than the second,

he raised the question as to there being other factors involved in maturity than those proposed in the papers.

The session closed at 11:45 A.M. At the joint luncheon which followed, the address was delivered by Rev. Peter Riga (reprinted on pp. 89-96)

Fourth Session—Thursday, April 2, 2 P.M.

The paper at the concluding session, called to order by Father Coyle at 2 P.M., was given by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert C. Wolff on the topic, "Cultural Formation of the Future Priest."

In the discussion which followed, the question was raised as to the desirability of using the Latin and Greek classics for the cultural formation of American candidates for the major seminary. Monsignor Wolff cited the directives of the popes in this regard. In pointing out that cultural formation should be suited to the needs of the people, the clergy and the times, he emphasized that the truths derived from the classics are always true but must be made to live for our times. He saw the use of translations as a means of getting around the fact that not enough seminarians seem to know Latin and Greek well enough to use the classics in the original languages. He recognized that there was uncertainty about the obligatoriness of Greek in the seminary, and the consequent tendency to reduce requirements.

The emphasis on sciences and modern languages was seen as adding to the difficulty in getting enough Greek and Latin courses in the curriculum by one speaker. Monsignor Wolff thought that the hours available could be used more effectively, and also pointed out that, generally, seminarians have more time for study than students in other colleges.

A participant in the discussion raised the point that seminaries are being traditionalist and uncritical in accepting a classical formation as the only, or the best, preparation for philosophy and theology. He asked whether this type of preparation was as relevant to modern culture as it was to past cultures, and suggested that the possibility of other ways should be examined. On the basis of low scores on the Graduate Record Examination Area Test in the humanities in his seminary, he wondered if the present curriculum was even transmitting the classical heritage.

Another participant observed that he knew a professor who taught the genus of the Hebrew language rather than the techniques of its use, with a good deal of success. He suggested that this procedure in Latin and Greek might be better than a concern with the technical aspects of the language, and more effective in conveying the classical heritage.

It was suggested that since the sum of knowledge was so great that everything couldn't be covered, it might be well for different seminaries to concentrate on different types of preparation for philosophy and theology, or that one seminary have different programs, classical, scientific, and so forth. It is unrealistic to think each seminarian can be an expert in every field. In the same vein, it was pointed out that law schools are not interested in the major field in college of applicants. Why could not theological schools also allow more leeway in the college preparation of its applicants, according to their interests and talents? It emerged that some seminaries already permit various majors, and that some experiments are going on in the sending of seminarians to other colleges for other majors.

An argument against these ideas was seen by one speaker in the experience of Protestant seminaries which allow a wide latitude in preparation at the college level and experience difficulty in teaching systematic theology to

students who have very different college backgrounds: they envy Catholic theological schools the common preparation of their candidates. Would abandonment of the requirement of a B.A. in philosophy be a means of permitting weaker students to get a B.A. in an easier subject?

One seminary reported it was tending toward a double program: one for future pastors with more sociology courses and reduction of the Latin requirement to a reading knowledge; another for future scholars and experts in theology, liturgy, et cetera, with greater emphasis on languages.

Another commented that an identical formation for theological students made it easier for the faculty of the theological school but that this was not necessarily good. Different formations might pose a greater challenge to the teachers.

The contribution that an intelligent use of movies can make to the cultural formation of the seminarians was recognized, but no concrete suggestions were forthcoming.

The discussion was terminated at 3:15, and was followed by the business meeting. The President called for the report on the Committee on Nominations, which was made by its chairman, Very Rev. John Danagher, C.M. The Committee recommended the reelection for another year of the incumbent officers (listed below). A motion was made to accept the recommendation, was seconded, and was unanimously passed.

After announcing his intention to appoint a Committee on Accreditation in the near future, and urging members to make suggestions to help in the search for an Associate Secretary for the Department, Father Coyle received a motion for adjournment which was seconded and passed.

REV. CONRAD FALK, O.S.B.
Secretary

Major Seminary Department: Officers 1964-65

President: Rev. Thomas W. Coyle, C.S.S.R., Oconomowoc, Wisconsin

Vice President: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Riley, Brighton, Massachusetts

Secretary: Rev. Conrad Falk, O.S.B., Conception, Missouri

General Executive Board

Very Rev. James A. Laubacher, S.S., Baltimore, Maryland

Very Rev. Msgr. John E. Murphy, Little Rock, Arkansas

Perseverance in the Seminary: Problems and Remedies*

MOST REVEREND JOHN J. WRIGHT, D.D.

Bishop of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

THE PROBLEM OF PERSEVERANCE during the years of seminary life varies from place to place and, no doubt, from generation to generation. Remedies effective to one place are frequently worthless in another; so, too, approaches to the question of perseverance which may be valid in one period of history appear to lose effectiveness with the changing patterns of passing time.

The Sacred Congregation of Seminaries has conducted a survey on the problem of perseverance as on every other aspect of vocations in the contemporary Church. The replies from 400 dioceses in every corner of the world confirm the *a priori* conviction that the problem is not alike in any two places.

Many of the problems which impede the recruiting of vocations and which beset the lives of the ordained complicate also the question of perseverance within the seminary. Let us concern ourselves not with the peculiar difficulties special to particular places but rather with the general problems which all but universally present themselves nowadays as obstacles to perseverance in ecclesiastical vocations.

Some of these difficulties relate to the problem of the initial shortage of candidates for the seminary. We must admit that there has been a general decline in the sense of vocation itself. Perhaps the awareness of the Providence of God is less sensitive in our mechanistic and secular civilization; perhaps even the Christian's consciousness of individual destiny and personal significance is less sharp in our so frequently collectivist, standardized, and impersonal civilization. In any case, not merely in what pertains to vocations to the priesthood but in all walks of life there appears to have been an eclipse—please God, temporary—of the awareness that every life involves a special call under the Providence of God; that every life involves a stewardship for which an account must be rendered to God; that every life is a mission. The basic sense of vocation which once gave meaning and direction to all walks of life has been a casualty of collectivism, existentialism, and secularism—three of the moods induced by a widespread practical atheism that, forgetting God, undermines the significance of the person and destroys the sense of individual vocation, whether to marriage, to a career, or to the priesthood.

By unhappy contagion this aspect of our civilization undoubtedly debilitates the sense of vocation even of many who enter the seminaries but who, in the

* This paper was delivered at a joint meeting of the Minor Seminary Department and the Vocation Section.

inevitable crises of the long years of study, fall by the wayside because not fortified by the powerful motivation that comes from intense awareness of having been called by God as was Abraham, or Aaron, or Moses, or Paul.

Accordingly, it must be an objective of all our teaching and preaching, on every level of the life and action of the Church, to restore the basic sense of vocation, lacking so universally among men to the great hurt of family life, personal growth, society and, specifically, ecclesiastical vocations. Only when a lively sense of the Providence of God and of the reality of individual vocation provides clarity, confidence, and purpose can we look for heroic responses to the needs of the time, whether in the Church or in civilization, whether as laymen, religious, or clergy.

Some of the special problems of perseverance in seminary years arise from difficulties within individual persons. Questions of physical health are obvious enough, but not so widespread as to call for extended comment; much more serious and even common in our generation are those psychological difficulties of a subtle kind, concerning which contemporary psychiatric and psychosomatic studies have made us so conscious.

This is a delicate, even dangerous field and some of us are tempted to consider that there has already been too much attention paid to psychological testings, their data and alleged significance. One shudders to think how much of the color, the accomplishments, and the mightiness of the things that God has done "through the weak and foolish things of this world" would have been lost to the Kingdom of Heaven on earth had earlier generations of Church history been bogged down by psychometric requirements and the seeming naturalism of intensive psychological screening.

On the other hand, sober studies of the problem of perseverance through seminary years warrant reference to certain psychological difficulties which might well be anticipated by prudent testing or might well be solved by psychologically sound counseling of students who have personality difficulties after entrance into the seminary. The Most Reverend Bishop of Monaco, Monsignor Barthe, contributes a discerning preface, well documented from canon law, pedagogy, and common sense, to Professor Paul Grieger's book *Caractère et Vocation*, a study of the place of psychological considerations in handling the problems of vocations, those of perseverance included.

A reading of Professor Grieger's book suggests that we may lose many candidates during the years when perseverance toward ordination is under trial simply because of our failure to use *constructively* the psychological sciences, not merely to discover individual defects but especially to remedy these. In all this, of course, the ecclesiastical sense will put one on guard against naturalism or any mere "psychologism" that might downgrade the essential place of divine grace in vocations and especially in perseverance. An ecclesiastical vocation, completely and properly understood, comes from God; it involves a divine grace which in turn involves the *complete* Christian in the realization of some plan of Divine Providence. The essential element of a vocation is linked to divine election and therefore to grace, as well as to a personal choice and cooperation with grace. But the criterion of a vocation, so far as the Church and the aspirant himself are concerned, depends on analysis of certain aptitudes and qualities, physical, intellectual and moral, which render a candidate acceptable. So Pope Pius XI emphasized twice, at least, in his encyclical on the priesthood; so would all agree.

The proper recognition of the place of psychological considerations, a study of temperament, basic character, and mental structure in determining the presence of a vocation or in meeting certain problems of perseverance in a

vocation, need not be inconsistent with recognition of the essential place of divine grace in both. Cardinal Verdier used to warn against inordinate or, rather, heretical dependence on God's grace in this connection; he used to say, by way of jest, that the grace of God might well turn a violin into a good violin or turn a trombone into a good trombone, but that it would never turn a trombone into a violin!

Hence, the pertinence and the need of helping students acquire sound psychological self-knowledge, just so interest in this does not become a species of psychological hypochondria but is a prelude to self-discipline and a means of avoiding drop-outs among students who might persevere if they knew the true nature and proper remedies of their psychological difficulties. They are most likely to persevere whose self-knowledge is clarified by sound psychology and whose self-discipline is the more exact and efficacious by reason of such self-knowledge.

It is on the psychological level that questions of nature and grace meet to solve or complicate one another according as prudent direction is present or indifference and neglect. This is the heart of many psychological difficulties in seminarians—the lack of proportion between *supernatural maturity* and *natural maturity*.

Such natural maturity consists in a normal adult condition and control of the body, the mind, the will, and the emotions. It means the mastery, in due stages and on their several levels, of natural faculties and human instincts so that these function in integrated equilibrium. Such an equilibrium expresses itself in responsible, intelligent, and effective responses to reality.

Supernatural maturity is characterized, above all else, by an adult faith. Such adult faith involves a familiar paradox, the paradox pointed out by Our Lord ("unless ye become as little children," Matt. 18:3) and explained by St. Paul ("Keep the innocence of children, with the thoughts of grown men," I Cor. 14:20). "The thoughts of grown men" in a truly adult faith center with dogmatic accuracy and fullness on the Person of the Risen Jesus. As Father Sauvage, superior of the Grand Seminary, Lille, points out: such thoughts embrace, man-fashion, the Paschal Mystery. They place the mature believer in the line of Abraham, whose God was able to raise the dead; they make the mature believer seek the source of sanctity and the pledge of resurrection in the Risen Christ; they prompt him to manly reliance on the sacraments, above all on the Eucharist; they give him insight into the mystery of his own identity with Christ, both dying and resurrected, and his own consequent part in bringing to pass the identity between Christ and humanity, all in the Church.

In a word, the ecclesiastical student of adult faith is a man who perceives by faith and resolves by grace to achieve what God has made him and calls him to become; who perceiving this, receives through the sacraments of the Church the dynamism of grace from the death and resurrection of Christ and brings this to the service of the Church, all with informed faith and disciplined resolution.

How achieve such an adult faith and blend it with natural maturity to produce supernatural maturity in our seminarians? How overcome the individual and personal, community and sociological impediments—not to say resistance—to such maturity? How help the seminarian "put away the things of childhood," the egocentricity which makes the child value things only in the measure that they serve or protect him, substituting for this egocentricity the Christocentric faith and cult which make Christ rather than self the measure of all things? How bring to maturity the childishness in faith

which keeps a student excessively dependent on those who initiated the faith in him but whose tutelage he can and must outgrow if he is himself to be capable of the spiritual paternity that is the privilege of priesthood? All these difficulties are weighed by Father Sauvage in "Maturation Humaine et Surnaturelle, Problèmes de Grands Séminaires," in the review *Vocations Sacerdotales et Religieuses* for October, 1961: an article analyzing that spiritual immaturity, the lag of supernatural behind natural maturity, which, of all psychological problems, probably accounts for most failures in perseverance.

Somehow the very content and manner of the teaching of our dogma classes must play the principal role in overcoming immaturity in faith and the consequent supernatural lag behind merely natural maturity. Properly related to ascetics and to spiritual motivation, dogma accomplishes this by what it teaches concerning Christ and what it teaches concerning priesthood. What better remedy for the disturbing sense of inadequacy which so often causes failures not to persevere? It is ironic that this sense of inadequacy should frighten away otherwise fit candidates, since a humble and wholesome sense of personal inadequacy is the first condition of the indispensable acknowledgment of the total part of Christ in the works of the priesthood or the religious life. It is not only the apprehensive student who suffers from feelings of inadequacy, but also the saint who asks the question that causes so many to drop out: "What can I possibly offer or do, given the sublimity of the priestly office and my inadequacy?" The answer is always and certainly, "*Nothing!*" If this were the end of the matter, there would be nothing further to be hoped either by the anxious student or by the ardent saint. But this is only the beginning of the matter, the recognition of the total dependence on Christ that our dogma classes must inculcate in students if they are to have the intellectual premises of a disciplined will to persevere in any vocation to serve the altar as priests or souls as religious.

Psychological attitude, too, but not without strong moral overtones, is a further cause of dropouts from the seminary, particularly in the sometimes arid years of long, long study. One fears that it is frequently almost an unrecognized sin, but it can be fatal to perseverance, the sin of *acedia*. I have had obvious victims of it tell me they had never heard of it! It is the fault from which Paul Claudel prays to be delivered in his prayer at the Seventh Station:

It is not a stone under foot, nor a tight-drawn halter,
But the soul that all on a sudden begins to falter.
Oh, scorching noon of our life! Oh, fall deliberately made!
When the magnet no longer has pole and faith sees no Heaven displayed.
Because the road is long and because the end is afar,
Because one is quite alone where no consolations are!
Oh, straggling aeons of time! Secret disgust, not withstood,
For this unbending commandment and this companion of wood!
That is why one flings out both arms like a swimmer losing his pace
And falls—no, not on one's knees, but blindly, full on the face!
The body falls, it is true, and the soul gives instant assent.
Save us from the Second Fall when *boredom* wakes wilful consent!

Of all the explanations of the mystery of non-perseverance in a vocation, this bored *acedia*, certainly on the moral level, is among the most frequent. This "melancholy loss of taste for things of the spirit" is akin to the tedium and ennui that begets a certain repugnance and characteristic fear in the

face of the effort needed for the fulfillment of one's duty. The Scripture describes the *accidioso* when it speaks of the slothful man who treats remote contingencies as if they were present, imminent dangers excusing him from action. For the slothful man there is always "a lion in the way, and a lioness in the roads" (Prov. 26:13). Anything to excuse action; anything to avoid work or even decision; such is the boredom of *acedia*.

To meet the tedious ennui of the long years between the first fervor and springtime of vocation and the eventual joys of ordination, many means, natural and supernatural, are useful. The examples of the saints, the encouragement of spirited directors, the development of strong supernatural motivation, and conscious, enthusiastic cooperation with the daily graces of the sacraments—all these are basic. *But important, too, is the keen intellectual stimulation that comes from access to good libraries, the opportunity at every stage of study for appropriate apostolic works and, of course, wholesome recreation.*

In his conference to the Third Meeting of Italian Seminary Superiors and Professors, Monsignor Ugo Cavalieri has made some pertinent observations concerning libraries in seminaries and the development of personal libraries by future priests (*L'Esortazione Menti Nostrae E I Seminari*, pp. 271 sq., Sacra Congregatio dei Seminarii, 1955). A powerful antidote to the dangerous boredom of *acedia*, as well as an important stimulus to intellectual growth, would follow from the full application to seminaries of the apostolic counsel of Pope Pius XII:

But for the encouragement of study, which is not infrequently made impossible for priests because of the meagerness of their financial resources, it is most desirable that the local Ordinaries, in keeping with the ancient and excellent practice of the Church, should restore to their former dignity libraries which were formerly attached either to the episcopal residence, or to Chapters of Canons, or to the parishes themselves . . .

These libraries should not be regarded merely as store-rooms for discarded books, but rather as something living, and should be equipped with suitable facilities for study. Above all, these libraries should be organized to meet the needs of our times, and be provided with publications of all kinds, paying special attention to religion and the social sciences, so that teachers, pastors, and especially newly-ordained priests, may draw therefrom sufficient enlightenment to enable them to preach the truths of the gospel and to refute errors.

If seminary libraries are living centers of proper priestly interest, as easily accessible and as regularly frequented as the refectories and gymnasiums, only less loved than truly devotional chapels, *acedia* will be a less likely peril. So, too, participation in programs of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, hospital and prison visiting, corporal and spiritual works of mercy, liturgical conferences, et cetera—all proportionate to the maturity and capacities of the seminarian—will at once serve the apostolic action of the Church and nurture the lively zeal of the future priest.

Another possible cause for failure to persevere can arise from the very nature of some seminary physical surroundings. In this connection Pope Pius XII raises an important point when he speaks of the need for prudent balance between Spartan simplicity and luxurious ease in seminary buildings. The discouraging effects of inadequate or squalid physical circumstances are obvious enough; but not less perilous to perseverance are the "palatial houses and luxurious ease and comfort" against which *Menti Nostrae* warns. The

most desirable candidates may fail to persevere in such sumptuous surroundings precisely because they will be spiritually uneasy in an environment which corresponds neither to that of the ordinary people of God whom they prefer to serve nor to that of the meek and modest Christ in Whose spirit they wish to serve. Moreover, the less sensitive, who remain untroubled in palatial houses, acquire therein tastes which may later be disenchanted with the result that they are unprepared to persevere in the less easy circumstances of their eventual missions and assignments. We may well ask, then, if mere comfort, when it is in excess of normal, manly requirements, is not itself a hazard to perseverance? The remedies for this difficulty are obvious!

An urgent question is suggested by Father Sauvage as to the extent to which a certain institutionalism, uncongenial to personality and itself easily remediable, may contribute to that lack of vital maturity, natural and supernatural, which we have seen to be a cause of failure to persevere. Certainly excessive institutionalism fails to correct such a lack, and, therefore, we do well to be on guard against any stereotypes that might become fixed institutional patterns. Father Sauvage quotes a description of one such which may not be typical but is, one fears, recognizable, with its atmosphere "*faite de petits can cans, de susceptibilités, de petites préoccupations, médiosance et autres mouvements d'opinion futiles . . . Atmosphère rapetissante, peu propice à une maturation de la foi et de la vie spirituelle.*"

The Sacred Congregation for Seminaries, in the admirable report of the conferences on *Menti Nostrae* already cited, has provided an example of the alertness of Italian seminary superiors and professors to the contemporary needs of the seminaries in their nation if these are to be organically sound, free from sterile institutionalism and forming a mature clergy. It would be well if each nation were similarly to explore the mind of *Menti Nostrae* against the background of its own institutions for training clergy.

The militaristic tinge of modern nationalism indubitably accounts for not a few of the problems of perseverance on the part of certain candidates for the priesthood. Compulsory peacetime military service, so trenchantly described by Cardinal Gasparri as the cause of so many and such great evils for more than a century ("*la vraie cause d'une multitude de maux qui ont affligé la société*") has taken its toll of perseverance in seminaries. The evidence of some nations where universal peacetime conscription has become engrained suggests that the disorders of subsequent marriage date from moral results of peacetime barracks conditions; the destruction of fitness for priesthood and of the virtue of perseverance, *inter alia*, seems not less certain a result of moral factors bad enough in all military situations involving the young, but fatal in a set-up of permanent peacetime conscription.

But even in less militaristic civilizations, there is a subtle temptation that saps the strength of perseverance in many ecclesiastical students during a period of history marked, as is ours, by frequent wars. Where ecclesiastical students are bound to military service, the dangers to eventual perseverance in a priestly vocation are already clear; where they are not so bound, the subtle temptation to which we allude asserts itself—and its effects may in some cases be even more disastrous than would be a straight call to service. The normal young man, normal in his virility and in his patriotism, may not be at ease in the cloistered security of the seminary when his kinsmen or contemporaries are risking their lives in response to their country's call. Patriotism is a form of piety with powerful emotional overtones and in

time of crisis it can dull the claims of other pieties. Patriotic, virile young men—and such our seminarians generally are—do not like to be thought of as shirkers, much less as shirkers from the danger that is a duty for their brothers in the world. This is a problem at the moment, a common one, in my opinion; it consists in the desire to perform one's military service, even though not obliged, before completing one's ecclesiastical studies, indeed, even at the risk of forfeiting them by interruption. The remedy can only lie, again, in heavy emphasis on every level of preaching and teaching on the full concept of piety; the hierarchy of obligations in piety; and the manner in which religious piety, perfectly performed, contributes supremely to the patriotic good, the common good of the brethren, more than any other form of piety and at a sacrifice far from less heroic than that of the soldiers of Caesar. Somehow we must make clear and cogent to our young men the ringing thesis of Cardinal Suhard: "That man who dies so his brothers can live, who washes the world in the blood of Christ and makes it acceptable to the Father, that minister of unity and peace, can anyone say he is a deserter?"

Broader than the misgivings arising from questions of military service, there are like fears, not so likely to be present in the youngest aspirant for the seminary but gradually manifesting themselves with the passing years. Strong in a period of revolution like the present time is the fear of being a curious character among men; a museum piece in one's civilization; irrelevant, however holy and admirable, to the cultural interests, political preoccupations, and common strivings of one's generation.

This fear has probably always been present in the priests of a people bound by their very faith, as are Christians, to be pilgrims and strangers on the face of the earth. It is a fear that is, in fact, well founded in the very nature of the priesthood, a fear which will less often cause men to faint and fail in their perseverance if it is faced honestly and its premise seen for what it is—that is, a reason for a *greater* not a *lesser* sense of relevance to the needs and worries of our times. In his luminous pastoral *Priests Among Men*, Cardinal Suhard treats of this "irrelevance" of the priest to our civilization, the paradox of the seeming futility of the most indispensable men, by putting the matter in a proper theological perspective which, clearly perceived and profoundly grasped, will help keep men of sound judgment faithful to their strange but sublime vocation:

Civilizations come and go; nations spring up and disappear "with their might and their glory"; the priesthood does not pass. It perpetuates itself on earth, in humility in its outward appearance, with nobility of a royal dynasty which has never known an interregnum. The priest is a strange man whom his contemporaries consider archaic but who is always modern and new. He is accused of being reactionary. The truth of the matter is that he is ahead of his time. He looks ahead. He prognosticates. He prepares for the future. He anticipates. He goes beyond all progress and humanism by constantly showing men Christ, the "new Adam," and begetting them into His transcendent life. But because he speaks the language of eternity he is not considered worth listening to.

People think he is removed from them because he breaks through ordinary conventions. They think he is indifferent because he keeps quiet and is given to meditation, whereas in fact he "considers the whole world as his parish." The ungrateful city ignores the fact that he watches

over it. It is unconcerned about the custodian who protects it during one night. It is not grateful to him for giving it life.

This is the eternal paradox of the priest. He is a study in contraries. At the price of his own life he reconciles fidelity to God and fidelity to man. He seems to be poor and weak. And indeed there is nothing weaker than a priest. He has neither political power nor financial resources nor the strength of arms which others use to conquer the earth. His strength consists in being unarmed and "able to do all things in Him who strengthens him." It consists in going, with an independence which his detachment makes possible, to those who suffer, those who are ignorant, those who fall. There has been nothing more belittled, nothing more misunderstood, nothing more attacked in all history than the priesthood. Yet it is only before a priest that people kneel. Well do they know it, those who would banish God's Church forever from the world! Until the end of time the priest will be the most beloved and the most hated of men, the most incarnate and the most transcendent; their dearest brother and their arch enemy! Until the end of time his mystery, which remains a holy enigma even to himself, will outlast world events and civilizations and be the great witness of the invisible kingdom. Priests know that when they go up to the altar for the first time. They are not ignorant of the fact that until death they will be the "sign of contradiction," a light for the children of light, darkness for the sons of the night.

I need not underscore the analogies which make this basic doctrine pertinent to all religious vocations.

Once again, therefore, the solution of a major problem impeding perseverance, that of a false understanding of the sign of contradiction that every priest must be, depends on how solidly but also how profoundly how persuasively our dogma is taught—*ut quae salutariter edocentur, intellectu capiant, corde retineant, opere exsequantur*. Wherefore, at every stage of studies, Christ and the dogmas concerning Christ must be the focal point of attention and the heart's core of love. *Solutio omnium difficultatum Christus*; perseverance is born of great love for Christ—but here, too, the axiom is valid: *nihil amatur quin prius cognitum*. How early, how intimately, how profoundly do our students come to know Christ—as Paul knew Him, or as knew Him that renowned French preacher, who said from the pulpit of Notre Dame: "Since first I came to know Jesus Christ, I have never felt seriously the power of any rival to Him!"

Yet it is precisely the rivals to Christ, competing for the hearts of our students, that explain the failures in perseverance in His footsteps. Those rivals explain most of the internal crises and individual tensions to which we have directed attention. Basically, they stem from the spirit of the times, and especially from these problems born of that spirit:

1. *Problems of contemporary education.*—So secular in its mood, so exclusively technological in its scientism, so negligent of humanistic studies (so little Latin, less Greek, scant philosophy), so indifferent to contemplation and to the teachings of revelation—and, therefore, so inadequate to give us students prepared to delight in theology, Scripture and the Sacred Sciences, and, therefore, to persevere in their pursuit.

2. *Problems of contemporary morality and moral atmosphere.*—So tainted by pansexualism, all pervading in its evil spell and debilitating the power to persevere even of the strongest and the soundest—an atmosphere that

prompts many to ask if all virtue, but especially perseverance in vocations, might not be strengthened if the age of confirmation were more closely related to the age of dawning susceptibility to sensualism and if, also, a more efficacious appeal could be made to maturely deliberate profit *ex opere cooperantium* from the strengthening and maturing power of Confirmation—that sacrament which, par excellence, should be the Sacrament of Vocations and of perseverance in them.

3. *Problems of contemporary civilization and cultural values.*—First, our civilization places a new and paralyzing emphasis on *security*: social security, health security, job security *everything is insured*. In the face of such a cult of guaranteed security, there is less disposition to take a chance with one's life, to gamble on the providence of God and to make unqualified offerings of one's self to the unknown and questioned will of God. There is less walking blind into Damascus, less uncalculating heroism. But suddenly the evidences of youthful generosity in Papal Volunteers, in Peace Corps, in Catholic Action apostolates of youth, in missionary adventure, remind us that generosity and idealism still flourish in youthful hearts and can be directed into persevering vocations.

Then our civilization fosters a sometimes misleading concept of "democracy," the egalitarianism of which destroys the sense of a spiritual élite, so necessary to the nourishing of true democracy and so essential to perseverance in a vocation to pursue the *optimam partem* and to resist reduction to dead levels of virtue and least common denominators of excellence. Not only does the egalitarianism of false democracy produce the cult of mediocrity which is hostile to perseverance in pursuit of greater perfection, but the libertarianism of a civilization forgetful of the freedom of the sons of God can also prove a pitfall in the path of perseverance. Among the "great possessions" of the young men who turn sadly from the call of Jesus today, the greatest is probably their sense of personal liberty. The initiate know well how consistent with the fullest human liberty is the grace of God, including the grace of perseverance in vocation; but many conferences and questionings reveal that the fear of loss of liberty is a greater contemporary obstacle to perseverance, as also to initial response to vocation, than are even the difficulties of the senses and instincts of flesh.

So far has this mistaken concept of liberty interfered with the normal Christian attitudes toward vocations that even devout parents and sensitive spiritual directors stand in terror of seeming to bring "pressure" by even prayer or persuasion on those who might seek or attempt to persevere in an ecclesiastical vocation. Monsignor Renard does not exaggerate when he puts the present problem of misconceived liberty in these words: "In order to be sure that we give a young man the liberty *not* to be a priest, we take away from him the liberty to be one!"

Here, obviously, is a problem to the correction of which prudent parents, enlightened educators, and wise spiritual directors must bring, all and severally, the remedy that can come only from an early and accurate understanding of what *liberty* is and what are its most noble and rewarding uses. Here, too, the early and accurate knowledge of Jesus Christ is essential, Jesus the Lord of Life freely choosing to die; the Lord of Majesty made, freely, obedient unto death—that freedom itself might be saved and sanctified.

Finally, and perhaps most pertinent of all, our civilization tends, by reason of the rewards and consolations which it exalts, to ignore or downgrade

the joys of the priesthood. The result often is that even the devout, perhaps even priests, certainly some pious writers, speak too much of the sacrifices of the priestly life and too little of its joys, its intense satisfactions and its sweet consolations. Perhaps there is too much emphasis even among us on the yokes, the burdens, and the renunciations of the priesthood. And here, also, the remedy lies in the rediscovery of Jesus Christ, every day, every year of progress through the seminary—of Jesus Christ and the encouraging, lifegiving words by which He insists that His yoke is sweet, His burden light (Matt. 11:30). If our dogma professors, our teachers of every discipline, our parents and priests will make clear again the true glory of the Cross and the joy that comes from its glad embrace, then will more young men take up that Cross and follow Christ—perseveringly, enthusiastically, all the days of their lives!—*usque dum vivant et postea!*

The Guidance Counselor and the Spiritual Director: The Distinct Role of Each

REV. WILLIAM C. BIER, S.J.

Chairman, Psychology Department, Fordham University

IN DISCUSSING THE ROLES of the guidance counselor and the spiritual director, I will be dealing with three concepts, and by distinguishing suitably among them I hope to elaborate the distinction, as I see it, between their roles in the minor seminary. The three concepts are *guidance* on the one hand and *psychotherapy* on the other, with *counseling* occupying something of a middle position between the two. Guidance is an extension of the teaching function and in its modern form a derivative of education. Counseling is an outgrowth of psychology, as distinct from education; while psychotherapy owes its origin to psychiatry. These are three different functions, they require different skills, and they should be exercised by different people.

THE SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR

The role of the spiritual director in the seminary is one which has been sanctified by a long and honorable tradition. There will be little disagreement, I would think, in affirming that his essential role consists in the formation and direction of seminarians in the spiritual life. Neophytes in the spiritual life, as minor seminarians certainly are, need someone to introduce them to the ways of the spirit, to teach each of them the meaning of responsiveness to the promptings of the Holy Spirit within them, and to set their feet firmly on the road to spiritual perfection. The possibilities of self-deception in the spiritual life are limitless, and the Church has always strongly emphasized the need for guidance in this area, particularly for beginners. Such guidance is the essential role of the spiritual director in the seminary, a role second in importance to none, and a role which modern accretions cannot be permitted to obscure.

Some of the above-mentioned functions of the spiritual director in the seminary will be taken over for religious seminarians by the master of novices, but even here the young seminarian, whether before or after the novitiate, needs a guide in the spiritual life. In the case of the diocesan seminarian, the role of the spiritual director is of crucial importance in the formation of the spiritual life of the seminarians. If the spiritual director does not fulfill this all-important function, who will do so?

The function of the seminary, whether minor or major, is twofold: (1) to instruct the seminarian in humane knowledge and in the philosophical and theological sciences needed for his priestly ministry; and (2) to form the seminarian in the spiritual life, without which his priestly ministry is in danger of being hollow and unfruitful. Whereas the entire seminary staff is devoted to fulfilling the first of these functions, the spiritual director is often left almost singlehanded to deal with the second. He cannot, therefore, be drawn aside from this essential task to lesser things.

It would be my thesis that the spiritual director is essentially a teacher, the teacher of the spiritual life to the seminarians. He exercises this teaching function by means both of group and of individual instruction. He instructs the seminarians collectively through his series of spiritual conferences (some of which, I realize, he may share with the seminary rector, depending on circumstances and tradition). These conferences yield in importance and significance to none of the formal classes which the seminarians attend. The spiritual director also instructs on an individual basis in the spiritual direction which he provides for each of the seminarians personally. This spiritual direction is guidance, guidance in the spiritual realm, but guidance nevertheless. Guidance, and spiritual direction with it, is thus an extension of the teaching function; it is individualized instruction, tailored to the needs of a particular person.

If I am correct in my basic characterization of the role of the spiritual director as that of the teacher of the spiritual life to the seminarians, several implications follow to which I should like to direct attention. They are principally the following four:

1. *The role of the spiritual director is a guidance role.* Apart from his formal instructions to the seminarians in his conferences on the religious life, the role of the spiritual director is that of a guide. Spiritual direction is spiritual guidance.

2. *Skills of the spiritual director.* It would follow from the point just made that the skills of the spiritual director are essentially those of the guidance expert. These are principally twofold: a competent knowledge of the field and the ability to impart this knowledge to others. The spiritual director is an expert in the spiritual life. He is competent to offer instruction in this area, which he does in his spiritual conferences, and advice which he imparts in his private conferences with the individual seminarians, guiding them in the development of the spiritual life as an individual growth within each of them.

3. *Specialized training.* The specialized training of the spiritual director in the seminary is essentially such as to make him an expert in his field, which is that of the spiritual life. The spiritual director should be no less expert than any other member of the seminary faculty and he, no less than any other faculty member, should earn his faculty appointment only after he has earned his post-seminary degree. His specialized field, I should suggest, should be ascetical and pastoral theology. The spiritual director should have some knowledge of psychology because he needs to be able to recognize psycho-

logical problems in the seminarians in order to refer them to the seminary counselor or, if need be, to the professional psychotherapist. I do not think, however, that he needs to have a degree in psychology, and it might even be disadvantageous for him to have one because this might lure him away from his guidance role into a counseling relationship with the seminarians and this, I believe, would not be advantageous, at least not in terms of his proper role as a spiritual director.

4. *Personality requirements.* Apart from the basic characteristics of prudence and good judgment, the spiritual director needs to be able to bring to his task a sympathetic understanding of and tolerance for the foibles and immaturity of youth, which not all priests possess despite their other excellent characteristics. Above all, however, he needs the ability and willingness to listen, and this is a capacity by no means to be taken for granted, especially not in priests, who after their years of seminary training feel that it is an almost essential part of their priestly role to tell those who consult them what to do. If the spiritual director is to guide the seminarian on an individual basis, he needs to know the seminarian as an individual, and this means that he must be willing to listen to him long enough to understand both his individual characteristics and his individual problems. It goes without saying, of course, that if the spiritual director is a teacher of the spiritual life, the most convincing form of teaching is good example. It would be evident that no one can effectively teach the spiritual life to others who does not have a deep and genuine spiritual life himself.

The role in which I have cast the spiritual director as sketched above is, if I mistake not, his more or less traditional role with certain overtones of my own and with, I hope, some clarification on at least some additional specifications. I cast him in this role because I think it is his proper role and I would hope that we would not try to solve the problems of the modern seminary by moving him out of this role or by burdening him with other obligations and responsibilities which are not appropriately his, and which can only detract from his essential role if they are assigned to him.

I believe, of course, that the modern seminary requires some additional services which perhaps were not required, or at least were not recognized as being required, a decade or two ago. These services should, however, be supplied by other personnel, not by the spiritual director. Notable among these additional services is counseling, which I should like now to discuss.

COUNSELING IN THE SEMINARY

I take it for granted that it is now recognized that the basic instructional approach, represented by the traditional role of the spiritual director with its emphasis on the imparting of information, is insufficient to help certain seminarians. The advice offered is simply ineffective, the direction given goes unheeded. If these young men are to be helped, some other approach must be employed, and this is where counseling, as distinct from guidance, enters the picture.

I assume that the spiritual director has made an attempt to understand the seminarian in question and that it is on a basis of this individualized approach to him that he offers his spiritual direction. Yet the advice is ineffective.

It is always possible, of course, that the advice given by the spiritual director is wrong. Even the most skillful of doctors can sometimes be wrong

in their diagnoses. The advice which the spiritual director is offering may be true in general, but it may not be applicable to this individual case. Sometimes the medicine which the doctor attempts to apply makes the patient sicker. This is the way the doctor knows that he is taking the wrong approach in this particular case. I would think it only proper to assume that the spiritual director would be no less open to self-correction in this manner than would the medical doctor.

The second reason why the advice offered may be ineffective might be because the individual in question simply is not open to direction and not amenable to formation in the spiritual life. In other words, such an individual does not want to devote himself to the pursuit of spiritual perfection, and this may be one of the ways in which his lack of vocation to the priesthood manifests itself. The things of the spirit, except in the minimal degree needed for salvation, are not for him. Such an individual, by assumption, would not have a vocation and the spiritual director would fulfill his proper function toward him in encouraging him to leave the seminary.

The third reason why an individual does not follow the advice which is given may be because he, for reasons which he himself does not really understand, is simply unable to do so. The defect here is not one of good will, but of a subtle psychological incapacity.

If you are trying really to help people, you very soon come to appreciate that it is not enough for you to understand their problems if you are unable to impart this understanding to them, or if they are unable to accept the understanding of their problems which you offer. Two basic conditions can develop in such cases, neither of them very desirable or very helpful.

Depending upon the type of individual with whom you are dealing, you may experience a direct rejection of your diagnosis and solution, so that you find yourself in the unhappy position of debating the matter with the person whom you are trying to help. Despite the patience which you may bring to a situation of this kind, you are likely to designate the individual in question as being stubborn and intractable. On his part the individual will come away from such a meeting more than ever convinced that he is right because you have forced him to defend his position. For you to help him subsequently, he will have to retreat from this position, and that is why it has become more difficult than ever for you to help him if not, indeed, impossible. The other type individual will listen respectfully, apparently even gratefully, but will nevertheless fail to apply the advice which is imparted. This will be because, in one way or another, he is unable to accept the solution offered as the one appropriate to his situation.

In the latter case which, in the seminary, would certainly be the more frequent of these special cases, the dominant impression created in the mind of the seminarian by the interview would likely be the conviction that the spiritual director did not "understand" him. Paradoxically, the very kindness of the spiritual director may well have the effect of deepening the discouragement of the seminarian. He would say, in effect, that even a person as kind and sympathetic as Father so-and-so does not understand me. He is likely to feel, therefore, more isolated and helpless than ever. It does little good, as you can see, for you to be convinced that you understand the seminarian, if the seminarian, in turn, is quite convinced that you do *not* understand him.

Actually, the understanding of which we are speaking needs to be more precisely specified. In terms of helping the individual, the understanding to be generated is not so much in the mind of the director or counselor as in the mind of the seminarian or counselee. And this is what is characteristic

of the genuine counseling approach as distinct from guidance, namely, that the understanding it seeks to generate is understanding in the mind of the person with the problem. It is a means of helping him to understand himself and his problems so that he may do something effective to remedy it.

Let us say a few words, at this point, about the nature of counseling and its differentiation from guidance. Counseling derives from psychology rather than from education, and emphasizes the development of understanding rather than the imparting of information as does guidance. The understanding which is sought in counseling is self-understanding, or insight, on the part of the counselee. The following features are characteristic of counseling and serve to differentiate it from guidance:

1. Counseling is not synonymous with advising. Progress in counseling comes through the thinking that an individual with a problem does for himself, rather than through suggestions offered by the counselor. The counselor's function is to make this kind of thinking possible, rather than to do it himself.

2. Counseling involves more than a solution to an immediate problem. Its function is to produce changes in the individual that will enable him to make wise future decisions, as well as to extricate himself from his immediate difficulty.

3. Counseling concerns itself with attitudes rather than with actions. Actions will change as counseling progresses, but these changes occur as a result of attitude changes.

4. In counseling it is an emotional rather than an intellectual attitude which furnishes the raw material of the counseling process. Counseling concerns itself primarily with feelings. Information and intellectual understanding have their place in the counseling situation, but the emotionalized feelings are given primary attention and can never be ignored.

5. Counseling inevitably involves relationships between people, although it may seem at first sight to be purely an affair of the person who is being counseled. It is difficult for a person undergoing counseling to understand why it is that the thinking he does in the counseling situation changes his life more than the thinking he does about his problem by himself. Actually, it is the relationship with the counselor which makes the difference.

The goal of counseling, as already indicated, is the development of self-understanding on the part of the counselee. As a great many of you would already know, there are two basic schools of thought and two divergent counseling techniques with reference to the achievement of this goal.

The first of these counseling approaches, the more traditional one, places the burden of understanding on the counselor. He has the greater maturity, the greater experience, and the greater technical training. In this method of counseling, the counselor assumes the responsibility for diagnosing the counselee's difficulties and coming up with an understanding of the problem. In such a counseling relationship the counselee equivalently says to the counselor: "I am a mixed-up person, and I have a problem. I do not know what to do about it. You are an older, experienced person, and it is, further, part of your office to help me with my problem. Here is my problem; I turn it over to you. What do you make of it, and what do you advise me to do about it?"

It does not take any great discernment to see that the priest, and especially the spiritual director in the seminary, who is not forewarned against it,

is an almost helpless prey against this kind of approach. He would feel that he was delinquent in his priestly duty, let alone his special office, if he did not accept responsibility for the problem which is thus dropped in his lap. The deception is that the acceptance of this responsibility may be the very thing which will prevent the counselor from helping the person who comes to him for assistance. His very sympathy and sense of duty betray him. At worst, in such cases, the well-meaning counselor after a short time becomes as emotionally involved as his client, and it becomes a question of the blind leading the blind. At best, his understanding of the difficulty may be accurate but he is then faced with the problem, already alluded to, of how to convey this understanding to the client. If the client cannot or will not accept the solution, has the counselor succeeded in helping him despite his efforts and his expenditure of time?

Even if the counselee apparently accepts the solution offered, it often has little strength because it is superimposed from the outside. The solution thus rarely effects a change within the client himself. His potentiality for handling difficulties is often not tested. He might accept the plan, but never really work at it because he has no ultimate responsibility for it, and then blame the counselor because it doesn't work.

It would be evident, I think, that the directive counseling approach comes close to guidance and that it suffers from many of the same limitations as does the guidance approach.

The above-mentioned difficulties with directive counseling have attracted many people to the opposite, or non-directive approach. This technique, also called client-centered, as opposed to counselor-centered therapy, focuses on the client and helps him to develop a satisfactory adjustment by himself. The central technique in this approach is the release of feelings and the achievement of self-understanding on the part of the client.

The approach here is quite different from that in directive counseling and the burden of responsibility for understanding and for a solution is put upon the client. The counselor equivalently says to the client: "I see that you have a problem. It is your problem and no one can solve it but you. You do, however, need help in solving it. I am willing to help you, but I can do no more than help. You are the only one who can solve your problem. If we work together on the solution of your problem, it must be on this basis." It is evident that the client must be active in such a counseling process, and that his is the responsibility for the outcome.

In this approach, as is evident, the counselor does not offer solutions to problems. Rather, it is the role of the counselor to develop self-understanding in the client himself. Of course, this approach is difficult, and much more so than might at first appear, but if you succeed in it, you automatically achieve a considerable portion of your counseling goals. And even if you succeed in developing only partial insight in your client, you have been at least partially successful.

There are difficulties, of course, with the non-directive approach. It sounds deceptively simple but actually requires considerably more counseling skill than does the directive approach. Time can also be a practical consideration because the non-directive technique, particularly when not skillfully handled, can become interminable. Finally, there is the question of the limit of non-directive counseling. The permissiveness which is a prominent feature of this technique cannot be without limits, and the moral limits to be imposed can sometimes present a not inconsiderable problem to the counselor, especially to the priest-counselor.

I would feel that no good purpose would be served in a presentation of this kind by trying to decide between the relative merits of these two basic counseling techniques. It is my own personal conviction that the effectiveness of the technique depends to a considerable extent upon the counselor. I am convinced that some people could never become non-directive counselors. They are too authoritarian, for one thing, and could never refrain from telling people who come to them for help, what to do. For others, it would be temperamentally impossible; they couldn't listen long enough, and they couldn't keep quiet long enough. But I think, on the other hand, that the non-directive approach is not the only possible way of helping people, even in a counseling situation, and there are some directive counselors who are very effective and who do a very excellent counseling job. I would add, however, that I find it difficult to conceive how the spiritual director, if he is to function as a counselor at all, can function as anything other than a directive counselor.

THE SEMINARY COUNSELOR

The topic, as you have invited me to discuss it, assumes that there is on the seminary faculty another priest, apart from the spiritual director, whom you have called the guidance counselor, but whom I would prefer to call the seminary counselor, or psychological counselor, or simply counselor, but not guidance counselor. I would ask for the change precisely in view of the topic which we are discussing, namely, the distinct roles of the two men.

As you would already know from my earlier discussion, I conceive the essential role of the spiritual director to be that of guidance. In his efforts to help the seminarians entrusted to his spiritual care, the spiritual director, especially when there has been no one else on the seminary faculty prepared to do so, has been pushed into assuming the role of a counselor. When he has become a counselor out of sheer necessity, I suspect that he has generally functioned as a directive counselor, and if so he has not essentially departed from his proper role of a spiritual guide. I would feel, however, that he should refrain from attempting to become a non-directive counselor because this is too difficult to combine with his essential role of spiritual guide. If he wears two hats, they should be two compatible hats. I do not think that the same man can effectively function as a spiritual *director*, and a *non-directive* counselor.

It seems clear to me, however, and I think also to you, that more extensive and more characteristically counseling procedures are needed in the seminary, and for this reason the additional office of counselor has been established in certain seminaries and hopefully will subsequently be established in others. What should be the role of this counselor?

It should be his role, I would suggest, to help by appropriate counseling techniques those seminarians who encounter *ordinary psychological* problems. The fact that the problems with which the counselor is competent to deal are psychological problems differentiates him, on the one hand, from the spiritual director, and the fact that they are *ordinary* psychological problems differentiates him, on the other hand, from the professional psychotherapist who would deal with the non-ordinary, that is, with the psychopathological problems of seminarians.

If you accept this formulation, there would be four ways in which the counselor would differ in his functions from the spiritual director. These ways would be the following:

1. With respect to *goal*. The counselor would have as his goal the development of self-understanding in the seminarian, whereas the spiritual director would aim at the imparting of appropriate information.
2. With respect to the *nature of the problem*. These would be psychological problems for the counselor, whereas the spiritual director would be concerned with problems of spiritual formation and direction.
3. With respect to *techniques employed*. The counselor, while not exclusively, would nevertheless most characteristically employ the techniques of non-directive counseling, while the spiritual director would employ basically guidance, or at most, directive-counseling techniques.
4. With respect to *numbers*. The counselor would deal only with those seminarians who developed psychological problems requiring his help, whereas the spiritual director would be primarily responsible for the guidance of all seminarians.

It is equally important to differentiate the role of the counselor, not only from that of the spiritual director on one hand but from that of the psychotherapist on the other. Both the counselor and the psychotherapist are concerned with helping people with psychological problems, but the kind of problem involved is quite different in the two cases.

It was suggested above that the seminary counselor should restrict himself to work with seminarians who have what were designated as "ordinary psychological problems." What are these problems? They are indeed psychological problems, but problems which the ordinary person of a given age and given circumstances might be expected to have. In other words, they are the psychological problems of normal people.

Since minor seminarians are young adolescents it is to be expected that there will be found among them a certain number of psychological problems characteristic of adolescence, notably problems in the formation of self-identity, in the resolution of the dependence-independence antinomy, and in sexual orientation. These areas which are troublesome for the adolescent generally are likely to be particularly so for the minor seminarian because of his attempt to combine the solution to them with the simultaneous assimilation of the ideals of priestly formation.

The restrictions of the minor seminary, necessary as they may be for priestly formation, are likely, nevertheless, to create psychological difficulties for the adolescent because they preclude the working out of adolescent problems along many of the lines available to other young people of the same age. If the seminarian is firm in his vocation, he may be saved some of the difficulty in the formation of self-identity experienced by his contemporaries outside the seminary for the reason that he is free of the "role diffusion"—that is, being torn between a number of possible roles in life—so frequently plaguing to the adolescent in our modern society. If, however, he is unsure of his vocation, this problem will descend upon him with redoubled force. In the matter of the dependence-independence dilemma, the seminarian is at an obvious disadvantage, so much so that the resolution of this conflict is often suppressed during the seminary years with a consequent postponement of psychological maturity. It should be equally obvious that the minor seminarian will experience greater difficulty than his non-seminary counterpart in establishing sexual orientation for, while the latter is required only to achieve a suitable heterosexual orientation, the seminarian is called upon to embrace the ideal of lifelong celibacy—an incomparably more difficult orientation for a young adolescent to achieve.

It should really come as no surprise, therefore, that a certain number of psychological problems should develop in the minor seminary. Because they are psychological problems, they require psychological techniques for their alleviation. In other words, seminarians with these problems are likely to be helped only to the extent to which some insight into their problems can be developed through successful counseling techniques. This is why the seminary counselor has an important role to fulfill in the minor seminary, and a role which, as described, encroaches in no way upon the functions of the spiritual director.

It should be evident from what we have been saying that the counselor is equally clearly differentiated from the psychotherapist. The latter deals with psychological disorders, in general with the neuroses and psychoses, which, by supposition, imply an abnormal psychological development and a disordered personality. The seminary counselor on the other hand limits himself to people whose psychological development has been essentially normal and whose personality makeup is sound, but who are currently experiencing a problem requiring psychological help. The psychotherapist deals with the psychologically abnormal person, and he characteristically attempts to effect some alteration in the total personality as a means of alleviating the psychological disorder. It is clear that the seminary counselor is in no sense a psychotherapist. He does not attempt to function as such, and he refers the seminarians who may have genuine psychological disorders to the professional psychotherapist, who is either a trained clinical psychologist or a psychiatrist.

What should be the training of the seminary counselor? At the very least he should have a master's degree in psychology. This degree should obviously provide a suitable emphasis in counseling, but not without a general background in psychology and personality theory (both normal and abnormal) upon which sound counseling procedures rest. Counseling is both a technique and an art, a science and a skill. Both theory and practice are needed in the preparation of a counselor.

SUMMARY

In summary, then, I would submit that the spiritual director and the counselor have distinct roles to fulfill in the minor seminary. The spiritual director is essentially the teacher and guide of the seminarians in the spiritual life. In his individual contact with them he functions fundamentally in a guidance capacity, his spiritual direction being individualized instruction in the spiritual life, tailored to the specific needs of the individual seminarian. If he functions as a counselor at all, he is a directive counselor attempting by advice, by persuasion, and by logical presentation to bring an understanding of the spiritual life to the young seminarian.

The counselor, on the other hand, finds his role in bringing to the individual seminarians the psychological help which they need to adjust satisfactorily to seminary life. His techniques, in contradistinction to those of the spiritual director, are characteristically non-directive techniques. He is dealing largely with the understandable, relatively normal emotional problems of the adolescent seminarian, and he seeks by a suitable release and reflection of these feelings to bring to the young seminarian the understanding of himself as a person and an emotional equilibrium that will enable him to function as a seminarian now and as a priest later, unimpeded by inhibiting and crippling emotional problems.

The counselor is not a psychotherapist and he does not attempt to function

as such. When he encounters psychological disorder in the form of neurotic or perhaps even prepsychotic behavior, he refers the seminarian with these troubles to a professional psychotherapist.

If the above formulation is seen as an acceptable one, then there is no conflict of role between the spiritual director and the counselor in the seminary. Each has not only a distinct but a necessary role to fulfill and each has his specific contribution to make to the well-being of the seminarians and their priestly formation.

College Entrance Policies

R. M. KEEFE

Dean of Admissions, Saint Louis University

THIS ASSIGNMENT might well be titled "The Return of the Prodigal Son." The incongruity of being asked to address a group of seminary rectors on the twenty-second anniversary of my demise from a mid-western theologate seems strange, indeed, and stranger still since that exodus was not entirely patriotic. You will recall that in 1942 available able-bodied men of twenty-five were in short supply within these continental limits; and so, it should not be said that the Church lost a potential minister but rather that the United States Army acquired a half-trained theologian to study Chinese and roam the South Pacific and the Orient. My seventeen postwar years as dean of admissions at a Jesuit university has brought a certain mellowness to my understanding of both seminary rectors and seminarians—and perhaps especially, ex-seminarians. I get them on the first bounce—the students whose spiritual quotient does not always match their intelligence quotient. I submit, however, that all is not lost when the seminary gates close behind the unfinished seminarian. If he lacks all other talent, and is able to live verbally beyond his intellectual means and make compromises for a living, he can always become a dean of admissions.

This paper is about policies that govern college admissions. I shall, for a few minutes, discuss college admissions in general, Catholic college admissions, the problem of college admissions and how it affects seminary admissions.

College admissions today is a booming business. When I returned from World War II, only a quarter of all college-age students were in college; today, more than 40 percent are in college despite the rising costs. Why is this? Good advertising? Have we startled Americans into believing that without a college education a person cannot be a success? What would the neighbors say if John doesn't go to college? We Americans do, however, believe that a college education is a precious commodity and that success without it is at best remote.

If a higher and higher percentage of our population is going to college, where is there any problem? The problem lies in the fact that college admission in this country (like almost everything else) is based on economics.

Private educational institutions draw more than half of their students from families in the top 10 percent of the nation's income scale. I think the implications are evident: American higher education is producing a social stratification which could hardly be called Christian or contribute to the upward social mobility of the economically less able. American colleges must make the sacrifice and take the leadership in providing for a greater percentage of good students who have severe financial limitations. It is no longer enough for those in high places to continue to talk of youth as our most precious commodity and then blithely sit by and watch this advantaged nation squander this precious resource. Only 70 percent of the students who complete the eighth grade are graduated from high school; of the 40 percent who enter college, only half are graduated.

What I am saying is that while a larger percent of our high school graduates are entering college, they are not always the *right* ones. More than 25 percent of our most capable youth do not go to college because of financial need. It is too bad our measures for selecting students have not kept pace with the building of new facilities. We still do not know *who* should be admitted to *what* college. In California, for example, where only the top 12 percent of the high school graduates are admitted to the state universities, the top one-third to the state colleges, and the rest of necessity to one of the state junior colleges, the drop-out rate is still significantly high. A great deal of this is because academic work is emphasized for many students whose need is for a technical curriculum. It will not be good if the new community junior colleges look on technical training as something less desirable than the traditional academic program. For many young people it means success and happiness where the stereotyped academic program would mean failure and often heartbreak.

Now, how did this great crisis in college admissions arise? Until World War II, most colleges did not require an entrance examination, and much emphasis was placed on the classical studies and quantitative norms, the completion of a certain body of work in each discipline. After World War II, when student recruitment came on the scene in force, the law of supply and demand took over. Listed requirements for admission became more vague, and colleges and universities filled their quotas with the best students they could find. State and municipal colleges and universities took all who applied and were high school graduates, and the selective institutions took those students they considered best qualified. This is how it still works today. Nevertheless, there are certain signposts which identify the admissions philosophies and methods in use in 1964 by our colleges.

Briefly, the nature of college admissions today might be indicated by the following:

1. Most good colleges today publish quantitative and qualitative admissions requirements. They likewise publish a freshman-class profile. This analysis of the class rank, test scores, and geographic distribution of each entering class is an honest attempt to tell those interested what the college is looking for in its student body.

2. Good colleges base the admissions decision on a weighted combination of three factors: the secondary school record, test scores, and the high school recommendation.

3. In most good colleges, admissions officers are an integral part of the academic administration of the institution. They are academic officers in a very real sense.

4. Good colleges report the grades of enrolled undergraduates to the secondary schools from which their students were graduated.

5. While most colleges employ a recruiting staff (admissions counselors), good practice dictates that these "field men" be more counselor than salesman and avoid "sales" tactics.

College admissions today, then, is big business; all of the latest methods and equipment are employed. With the advent of public relations and development offices on university and college campuses, student recruitment occupies a place of great import. Dormitories and classrooms must be kept full to balance the budget and project the proper image.

With these observations on college admissions in general, let us look at what is perhaps more pertinent to this meeting—Catholic college admissions. First of all, let us be quite clear in stating that, as much as we should like to believe it, there is no Catholic college or university which enjoys the luxury of a great bulk of applications for a few places in a freshman class. Among the Catholic universities there are perhaps six or seven that do not admit at least 75 percent of those students who apply for admission; two or three among the Catholic men's colleges; four or five among the Catholic women's colleges. It is fair, then, to state that Catholic colleges and universities are not among the most selective in their admissions process. This is not surprising when we look at college costs: \$2,500 per year is average for good private colleges. The supply of those who can afford that cost is just not that large. How can you expect a family to spend 35 to 40 percent of its yearly income to send one student to college when there are three or four others who must attend college also?

Likewise, an analysis of scholarship aid available in most Catholic colleges finds funds for student aid woefully small when compared to the prestige schools. There are some notable and refreshing exceptions, Boston College, for example. Many Catholic colleges must rely heavily on the NDEA loan program and on providing campus jobs for worthy students. It has always been a mystery to me how little endowment income is available to most Catholic colleges. One wonders what we were doing all these years. I suppose there were just too many Catholic activities which needed money—brick and mortar for the churches themselves, missions, seminaries. In the era of the rugged pastor, churches for all the Catholics certainly loomed more important than colleges for the few. It is only the zeal and dedication of the various religious orders themselves which enabled Catholic higher learning to grow as much as it has. The Catholic colleges and universities can thank the occasional scholars of the religious orders who carried the medieval religious-scholar tradition to American higher education.

One of the real unsolved concepts of our schools has ever been (and still is) the strength of the word Catholic on Catholic higher education. How is a Catholic college different from a secular college? Why should a family make a great financial sacrifice to send a young Catholic student to a Catholic college? Few Catholic educators doubt that at the very heart of all learning is the Christian religion. Who can deny that the Hebraic-Christian culture is one of the great cultures that produced the Western world. It has supplied much of our art, music, literature, philosophy, and history. Religious ideas give wholeness to the mind's activities: Who can legitimately seek truth and ignore religion? How can a man find his own life and find it

wisely and abundantly without religion? No Catholic school need apologize for requiring two or three courses in religion in its curriculum. Catholic colleges do not set any spiritual "bear traps" for their students, but can anyone blame them if they want their students to know and appreciate the fundamental truths of Christianity? Catholic colleges are dedicated to the glory of God. The glory of God is badly served by second-rate courses in the arts and sciences. Catholic colleges are committed institutions, but need there be any real incompatibility between a Catholic education and a liberal education? Certainly, Catholic colleges must be willing to conduct a full examination of themselves. Unfortunately, we have often been quite slow in doing this. True, there is no Catholic mathematics or Catholic physics, but is it too much to ask that mathematics and physics be considered in the light of all we know as men? Catholic education does not deny examination, but merely asks that the examination be complete. Is not each student a child of God as well as a potential engineer or doctor?

Most (if not all) Catholic colleges are still among the nonprestige private colleges which are suffering more and more from inaccessibility to adequate finances. As I indicated earlier, private education draws over half of its student body from the top 10 percent of the nation's income families. This severely limits the Catholic college recruiting pool, especially when we consider the great amount of scholarship money available to the so-called prestige private colleges and universities.

I hope I do not shock you when I tell you that, despite all you read about crowded colleges, there are not ten Catholic colleges and universities in the United States which do not have vacant spaces. Might I add that this condition will worsen before it gets better—indeed, if it ever does get better for some of our colleges. Many a family must spend one-fourth to one-third of its annual income to send one child to a private college. Feeding the rest of the family comes before a Catholic education for Johnny. In these ecumenical times, why spend \$2,500 to send Johnny to St. Jerome's when he can attend the local community college for \$250!

The truly superior student will continue to receive the bulk of scholarship aid, but what about the strong "B" student? He can look forward to little financial help other than NDEA and other loan programs. He will be consigned to a low-cost college. This cost crisis is indeed serious for Catholic colleges. Many of them are already finding it more and more difficult to maintain their facilities and to hold their good lay faculty members, despite a tuition raise every two or three years. As Catholic colleges, most of which are all too slow in placing laymen in strategic administrative and faculty roles (other than in fund-raising and athletics), feel this financial squeeze, I fear that many will revert to "Catholic housing projects" for the sons and daughters of the wealthy but intellectually weak.

Every Catholic college and university has a development program. I offer the opinion that an analysis of these programs will reveal less than 10 percent of their primary needs is for student aid. What good are these Catholic facilities if able students cannot afford to use them? In general, then, while Catholics appreciate their higher educational institutions and should like to use them more extensively, this will not be the case in the next decade. They just cannot afford it. There are solutions: Federal and state scholarship programs, and allocating more development funds to student aid are two possibilities. But something must be done soon or there will be no Catholic college admissions problem. There will be Catholic colleges only for those

fortunate young men who happen to be wealthy and bright. Unhappily there are not enough of this group to go around.

WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT ON SEMINARIES?

Now, what is the effect of this pattern of college admissions in general and Catholic college admissions in particular on seminary attendance? First, of all, of course, since seminaries are schools and colleges they must keep abreast of what other schools are doing in all areas and take advantage of the new and more efficient methods in teaching and administration. It is unrealistic for a seminary, just because it is a seminary, to refuse to streamline its office procedures, or to refuse to use proven audio-visual teaching aids just because they were not used in medieval times. The fact that seminary students are preparing for the priesthood should not penalize them as students and scholars. All too often, I am afraid, the fact that seminary education is special or different is an excuse for uninspiring pedagogy and sloppy administration. Just because a young man sets the priesthood as his goal, it does not follow that intellectual excitement in his formative years is not also a legitimate goal. It is often said that a cassock can hide a multitude of sins; let us hope that one of them is not intellectual sterility. Priests should be learned men. It is difficult for a young man to become learned unless he is inspired, goaded, and encouraged by good teaching and exciting academic projects.

What about seminary admissions? How can seminaries admit a greater percentage of students who will persevere to ordination? How can seminaries be sure they are getting the right students? Answers to these questions certainly are not easy to come by. Fortunately, economics have seldom prevented a young man from attending a seminary. Let us trust this will continue. Fortunately, too, the tradition in the United States has been for the brighter students to attend seminaries. If Latin does nothing else, it certainly has a way of proving who these brighter students are. There is no reason why the standard aptitude, ability, and achievement tests cannot serve a seminary in the same way they serve other schools and colleges. This is done in most cases. It is encouraging to see that even the most conservative priests and nuns realize that education for the priesthood is still education; and as such, good basic talent and good study habits must accompany good spiritual habits.

The on-going studies of motivation certainly should be of great interest to seminary officials. Deplorably, progress is extremely slow in these research efforts. Will the day come when we shall be able accurately to test motivation: What makes Johnny run, and run in a particular direction? Those of us who believe in free will—freedom of choice—cannot be too optimistic about finding a single set of characteristics which, when isolated, could provide us with the perfect young man for seminary training. We still have many years of going along with the imperfect youth who seems at the moment serviceably sound.

Seminary admissions, then, are somewhat less complicated than secular admissions, mostly because the economic factor is not as important for the applicant. Very few millionaires' sons become priests, but most millionaires want to be sure that the sons of others do. Bishops, of course, encourage them. The usual factors, class rank, curriculum, test scores, recommendations of principals and counselors, must be used to admit students. None as yet has developed an SQ (spiritual quotient) to go with the IQ. Perhaps

we might do better in seminary admissions and seminary education if we did not tell ourselves so often that seminary training is special and not really like other academic training. I have heard seminary rectors say that no seminary student is ever asked to reconsider his vocational choice because of studies alone. This, I say emphatically, is wrong, especially in seminaries where men are trained for the active ministry. As the general population becomes better educated, so must the clergy, only at a more rapid rate. If our present seminary system is to continue (and I am not at all sure that radical changes are not necessary, especially in the pre-theology seminaries), then in the area of admissions as well as in all other areas, the latest and best techniques employed by the best schools must be used.

This has been a somewhat cursory paper on college and seminary admissions, and particularly on Catholic college and seminary admissions, but even a more scholarly analysis would not come to a more meaningful result. Ultimately we must always ask the question, "What are we trying to do in education, and in Catholic education uniquely?"

There is an old Persian legend about a holy man who engaged himself for many years in good works. Ultimately he came to feel that he was most certainly worthy of a place in the kingdom of heaven; so he climbed the ivory stairs, according to the legend, and knocked at the golden gates, where a Voice said, "Who is there?" The holy man answered in a voice ringing with pride, "It is thy worthy servant, O Lord." But the gates remained closed. He wearily retraced his steps to earth. For many more long years, he rededicated himself to good works, until at last the light came to him, and he realized why he had been found unworthy. He climbed again the ivory stairs, and again he knocked at the golden gates. When the Voice challenged him, he replied, "It is thy son, O Father." The gates opened and he entered in.

This, then, is our aim in all college and school admissions: to provide a fitting vehicle on the road to service, success, and happiness for those eager but immature youth who come our way, so that they might be in fact sons of truth, and, indeed, sons of the Father.

• PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS

Resolutions of the Minor Seminary Department at the NCEA Meeting, Atlantic City, April 1964

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That special thanks be extended to His Excellency Celestine J. Damiano, D.D., Bishop of Camden, for his most gracious hospitality.

2. That special thanks be offered to the Most Reverend John P. Cody, D.D., Apostolic Administrator of the Archdiocese of New Orleans, our President General for his continuing helpfulness in dealing with the problems of American seminaries.

3. That the thanks of the Minor Seminary Department be expressed to the Rt. Rev. Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, the Executive Secretary, for his continued interest in and support of the work of the Minor Seminary Department.

4. That our gratitude be given to the officers of our Department headed by Father Donald J. Ryan, our President, for their efforts in promoting the formal and informal convention activities and for their effective and energetic leadership.

5. That the gratitude of the Department be extended to the speakers who have given so freely of their time to address us at our convention. May we be challenged by the ideas they presented to us.

6. That the special thanks of the Minor Seminary Department be given to the pastor of St. Nicholas Church for acting as our host for the informal sessions of the members of the Department.

(REV.) ROBERT C. NEWBOLD
for the Resolutions Committee

Minor Seminary Department: Officers 1964-65

President: Very Rev. Donald J. Ryan, C.M., St. Louis, Missouri

Vice President: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Ralph M. Miller, Buffalo, New York

Secretary: Very Rev. Msgr. John O'Donnell, Chicago, Illinois

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis E. Riedel, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Very Rev. Herman Romoser, O.S.B., St. Meinrad, Indiana

- *Joint sessions of Major and Minor Seminaries:* See paper by Father Kennedy, page 79; paper by Father Riga, page 89. *Joint session of Minor Seminary Department and Vocation Section:* See paper by Father Wright, page 103.

National Needs and American Higher Education

FRANCIS KEPPEL

*Commissioner of Education, U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.*

THE PROCESS OF CHANGE in society is continual. There are few times when we can mark the beginning of an era. At some point in these past few years our Nation entered a new age. This is the age of automation, an era when fewer hands can produce more goods, when muscle is being replaced by machines and by the highly trained minds of men. The growth of technology, of course, is not new. But what is new is the sweeping pace at which this change is taking place.

As a layman peering into the new world on which science is raising the curtain, I find myself duly and properly amazed. Back in Washington, a computer created only the day before yesterday is already preserved at the Smithsonian Institution, a historical relic. It was just over a decade ago that the computer was introduced commercially. Changes now come rapidly and each day brings some new discovery. At the present accelerating rate, creative thought and invention will lead to a world fifty years from now as different from ours as the present is different from the world of the nineteenth century.

In days of climactic change, men look properly to education to find their bearings, to guide their way toward uncharted frontiers. Now, as never before, education is summoned to service—to meet the changes in our economy and society, to supply the skills needed in our increasingly interdependent world, to prepare Americans for a day in which the only constant appears to be change itself.

This afternoon, my assigned theme is America's national needs and higher education. It is a challenging and provocative theme, for clearly it is in higher education—through the expansion and growth of our colleges and universities—that we shall find the ultimate expression of new knowledge and understanding.

In talking with you about the challenges now faced by our colleges and universities in this season of change, I want to underscore that our young people are the one single resource that our country can no longer afford to waste. If a man or woman who wants and can benefit from college fails to get there because he is poor, it is a national loss. When more than 100,000 qualified students lack the opportunity for higher education, then the waste is tragic, if not irreparable. It affects every American and every facet of American life.

The forces of the early twentieth century which raised educational opportunity to include the high school now demand broad opportunities for higher

education. In every occupation, the level of educational competence is being constantly raised. The last decade brought a 54 percent increase in the number of jobs requiring four or more years of college. The accelerating expansion of knowledge, the growing complexity of our world, and our advancing technology assure us of a phenomenal demand for higher education in the decade ahead.

To assure ourselves of a reasonable chance to meet this demand, we must clearly create an educational enterprise which extends to every individual the opportunity to develop his human resources to the maximum of his capacity, his talents, and his diligence. It must provide not only for increased levels of initial higher education but also for the continuous re-education necessary for adults to keep abreast of change.

Our national image of higher education is a composite of images of individual institutions. And yet no one institution—indeed, no one kind of institution—can be all things to all people. Each institution has areas of emphasis and areas of strength. The small college, the large university, the junior college, the graduate school—each has its place in the total enterprise to accommodate the growing demand for the kind of higher education which will enable each individual to go as far and as fast as he can toward his own personal and intellectual development.

It is through such diversity among institutions that we can best serve the whole range of our higher education needs, from post-high school vocational programs for technicians to advanced professional programs beyond the doctorate. As society demands that we respect the unique abilities and talents of individuals, so must we respect the integrity of diverse types of institutions in the total educational enterprise.

A century ago, the land-grant colleges brought a virtual revolution in higher education through their response to society's demands for a variety of programs and services. Today, with the spread of the junior college, we may be on the brink of another educational revolution, one which brings appropriate higher educational opportunities within the financial and geographic reach of the many at the same time that it supplements and strengthens the programs of senior institutions and professional schools.

To the extent that we can make higher education accessible to all who can benefit from it, society can be assured of educated manpower and leadership; and individuals—both youth and adults—can be assured of appropriate educational opportunity. In this way, colleges and universities not only serve their local areas as vibrant intellectual and cultural centers; they contribute substantially to the development of individual capabilities which will move and shape the society of the future.

In this connection, we might well recognize that there are important interrelationships between the traditions of the past, from which we are never really free, and preparation for the future, which we seek to accommodate and to improve. It is not enough for higher education simply to pass on the culture of the past or the knowledge of the present, however important these may be.

If our young people are to keep a jump ahead of ignorance of what is known, to avoid early obsolescence of fixed beliefs and skills, to develop a zeal for learning that advances in even pace with age, colleges and universities must help them cultivate an approach to learning and to life itself that will provide for the continuous renewal of information, the continuous reassessment of goals and their relationship to a changing world.

In pointing to the improvement of individual learning as the primary func-

tion of higher education, I do not mean to divert attention from the importance of financial support. Unless we recognize the interrelationships between educational opportunity and financial support, we shall fail to build the framework for bringing our goals to reality.

Walter Lippman has framed our challenge in this way: ". . . we must measure not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but what it is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish. We have learned that we are quite rich enough to defend ourselves, whatever the cost. We must now learn that we are quite rich enough to educate ourselves as we need to be educated."

Perhaps the Achilles heel of education is that it goes on, in one form or another, despite all obstacles, many of which sap its quality. Through neglect we far too often maintain merely the form of education without the substance. Sometimes I wish our neglect would bring the whole process to a halt. Perhaps then our concern for truly effective education would match the need. Perhaps then we would find and convey to all Americans a responsible and vital sense of urgency.

To move education forward, to bring about that greatness in our society which is our purpose, we must not only accept the responsibility for setting and achieving education's goals but also for explaining our objectives in terms of the Nation's human and economic requirements.

The general public will *not* respond to the problems of education unless education makes clear what these problems are.

The general public will *not* respond to our calls of urgency unless we back them up by our actions. Education must talk about its problems in the public interest and in the national interest, not only in the interest of education itself.

Let us look at some of the major tasks before us.

We pay lip service to the ideal of equality of educational opportunity, but we cannot be proud of our record. We live with vast differences in educational opportunities among the states and among the regions and cities and parts of cities within the states.

The public hears about the 6 out of 10 high school graduates who go on to some form of post-high school education. The public hears less about the waste of our human resources—the one-third of our young people who do not complete high school at all, the 5 percent who do not even complete the 8th grade.

The general public is *not* well informed about the vast gaps in the quality of education being offered at the elementary and secondary level, gaps which complicate and hinder the search for excellence among our institutions of higher education.

The general public does *not* know that the upper three-fourths of the graduates of some high schools are better prepared for college than the upper tenth in many other schools. The public must be impressed with the need to provide high quality education in all areas and at all levels if we are to meet the human and economic needs of the Nation.

Our job is more than proclaiming problems and urging progress. We must provide solutions for problems and we must demonstrate progress.

Let me illustrate the size of our task.

In the fifties, the college-age population—18 to 21 years old—increased by 4 percent. During this decade, it will increase by almost 57 percent—by some 5,216,000 persons in this age group.

Enrollment in our colleges and universities increased by more than 50 percent in the decade between 1950 and 1960, and is expected to double in the present decade. We may have 7 million enrolled by 1970.

This population and enrollment growth requires an expansion of physical plant costing roughly \$2.3 billion a year, but we have been spending only \$1.3 billion annually for plant expansion. This need for new facilities was met in part last year by the 88th Congress which passed more significant educational measures than any Congress in history. One of its landmark measures, the Higher Education Facilities Act, authorizes \$1.2 billion in Federal funds over three years to help our colleges and universities build laboratories, classrooms, and libraries.

But buildings alone are not enough. In higher education, as throughout education, virtually everything is in short supply except students. Our besetting shortage is teachers—of enough teachers at every level from the graduate school to the primary school, of enough qualified teachers, adequately trained and skilled to bring the substance of our new knowledge to every level of instruction and to all our people.

Our colleges and universities, of course, are only a part of our educational enterprise. Higher education cannot achieve its goals if our elementary and secondary schools are forced to limp along with insufficient staff and inadequate facilities. Higher education must be as concerned about the quality of elementary and secondary school education as those who labor at these levels of education.

In the words of President Kennedy, "Education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools; the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education."

All American educators, whatever their specific responsibilities, must continuously inquire whether our educational system provides sufficient opportunities and incentives for our young people to develop their talents to the utmost, whether our adults may continue their self-development throughout life, whether we have the means to prevent school dropouts and to expand the reach of education to our impoverished areas where educational attainment is far below what it must be.

As the ultimate promise of education stems from our colleges and universities, let us explore the relationship here of opportunity to ability to pay. When we turn to the question of college costs, we find that in public higher institutions, for example, they show a range from an average of \$730 in 1930 to a predicted \$2,400 by 1980. In the school year 1962-63, the average direct cost of attending college was approximately \$1,480 in public institutions and \$2,240 in private institutions. When we compare these costs with today's annual median family income of \$6,000, it is evident how substantial an outlay college education now presents for American families. As a major item of family expenditure it is exceeded only by the cost of a home.

It is no wonder, then, that each year more than 100,000 high school graduates with high aptitudes and interest in college fail to continue their education because of financial inability. According to findings in 1962 by the Office of Education-financed Project Talent, 30 percent of high school seniors in the 80-90 academic percentile of their class and 43 percent of those in the 70-80 percentile failed to enter college.

Other findings of Project Talent demonstrate that youths from low income families, regardless of academic ability, have a far poorer chance of going to college than their classmates from upper income families. Students in the top 2 percent of their class reach college regardless of family income because numerous colleges are on the lookout for such exceptional candidates. Below this top level, the facts are far less encouraging. Today, of American high school boys in the second quarter in general college aptitude, 51.8 percent from families with incomes below \$3,000 per year will fail to enter college, as contrasted with only 20.3 percent from families with incomes above \$12,000. For girls the situation is even more inequitable; in the second quarter, in general college aptitude, 74.8 percent of students from families with incomes below \$3,000 annually fail to enter college compared with 29.2 percent from families with incomes over \$12,000.

I think it is shameful that this Nation permits income to determine who shall be educated and who shall not, and, hence, who shall rise to positions of leadership and personal fulfillment and who shall not.

Moreover, enrollment figures indicate that approximately 40 percent of all students who begin college withdraw before graduation. Again, many of these are talented but leave college because of financial hardship. Surely this is an intolerable loss to the Nation of urgently needed college-trained manpower.

Whenever we deny an American youngster with college capabilities an opportunity for a college education, we do not simply limit one individual's potential—we also retard the Nation's intellectual and scientific advancement, we slow its economic growth, we diminish its future leadership.

If we would make good what we say—that education is the key to opportunity and that equality of educational opportunity is the right of every American—then we must find ways and means to extend the possibility of college to our capable but needy youth. We should seek to expand this possibility through student loans, work-study programs, and scholarships. In this undertaking, the Federal Government as well as the institutions themselves could provide greater opportunities than we find at present.

At the same time, we need to recognize that college enrollments will continue to grow, whatever we do, and that this growth in itself presents problems as well as possibilities. We need to be concerned now, and plan now, so that our higher education of tomorrow will exist in substance and quality as well as in form and quantity. Today, the omnibus of higher education is racing full speed down the road. But it is in serious danger of running out of gas.

Specifically, I would underscore the prime importance of sharply increasing our supply of well-qualified teachers for our colleges and universities in the years just ahead. With doubled enrollments just around the corner, the need for qualified college teachers grows more crucial with every passing semester.

Indeed, unless larger numbers of highly qualified college teachers can be produced—and produced soon—higher education as we know it today will be thoroughly blocked and frustrated. Adequate college facilities without adequate staffs is folly, of course.

Since teachers in quantity must and will be found, the real problem is to maintain and improve the quality of their preparation in the nation's college faculties. The threat to this quality can be seen in the fact that the percentage of new college teachers holding doctoral degrees has declined from 31 percent in 1953-54 to 25 percent in 1962-63.

Estimates indicate that approximately 320,000 new college teachers will

be needed during the decade of the 1960's, but that, at the present rate, only 141,000 doctoral degrees will be earned during this decade. Only about 45,000 of these will be among the group of newly entering college teachers. At this rate, only 14 percent of entering college teachers will hold doctorates, an alarming deterioration from minimum acceptable standards of 30 percent.

This deterioration will continue, in my judgment, unless it is checked by vigorous Federal action through an expanded program of graduate fellowships. Shortages in many key academic fields will soon become as severe as they are today in mathematics. In this field, some 300 Ph.D.'s are granted annually. More than half of these recipients enter industrial research. Less than 150 remaining Ph.D.'s are then available to the 2,100 accredited colleges and universities of the Nation—a ratio of 1/14th Ph.D. per college.

Expanding the number of graduate students and speeding the completion of their studies will help produce the urgently needed supply of well-trained college teachers. Without an expanded fellowship program coupled with a determined drive to recruit and retain able professors, we will neither be able to meet the needs of our surging college enrollments nor the demands of our growing market for trained manpower.

If I have stressed the need for Federal aid to extend higher education to all our people and to prepare our colleges and universities for their role of tomorrow, I do so with no less emphasis on the need for understanding and support in every sector of our society.

As President Johnson put it: "The Federal Government can provide leadership, information, and other assistance, but fundamentally it is action carried forward in each community that will decide how well we achieve our national objectives."

I have faith that we will successfully make the transition through education into our new technological world. This is a Nation of determined people. We have not heretofore faltered when faced with difficulties, when the times demanded our highest purpose.

To devote less than our best to education is to sell short the American dream and its promise. To deny educational opportunity to any of us diminishes us all.

Together, with rededication to the American ideal of universal education, we shall meet the challenges of our new age and enter it with renewed confidence in these last decades of our twentieth century.

The Responsibility of American Catholic Higher Education in Meeting National Needs

VERY REVEREND PAUL C. REINERT, S.J.

President, Saint Louis University

THE PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT of Catholic higher education is based on the assumption that we have something unique to offer for the benefit of American society. Past decades give ample proof that our colleges and universities have made a significant contribution to the educational, cultural, and scientific growth of the United States. Our responsibility today, therefore, in meeting national needs is to *improve* the quality of that specific kind of education which is declared to be our unique objective. This paper is intended to outline four mandates which are of special importance to us at this time in our history. These mandates point to concrete positive steps which we must take if the quality of our performance is to continue to grow.

FIRST MANDATE

Catholic higher education must plan and govern and in some cases restrict its own growth lest it reach a point of proliferation where quality is seriously impaired. It is obvious that Catholic higher education can and should expand. What is to be avoided is unplanned growth, yet there seems to be rather alarming evidence that excessive proliferation is already in process, both in the case of colleges exclusively for religious, and for colleges intended largely for lay students.

a) In regard to *colleges for religious*, an NCEA Research Office report reveals that there are now 93 colleges for the education of sisters, 49 of which have been founded within the last 10 years, only 3 of the latter being regionally accredited. Statistics from 43 of these recently founded colleges show that the total full-time enrollment was 2,094, with one third (869) in the 3 regionally accredited colleges. The total enrollment picture is as follows:

- 15 colleges enroll 1 to 25 students,
- 19 colleges, 26 to 50 students,
- 4 colleges, 51 to 75 students,
- 1 college, 76 to 100 students,
- 1 college, 101 to 200 students,
- 3 colleges (the regionally accredited) over 200 students.

The administration and teaching staff of these 43 colleges in 1961-62 totaled 437 full-time and 350 part-time persons. In all 43 colleges, 107 staff members hold a doctorate; 342, the master's degree; 18, some professional degree; 118, the bachelor's; 90, apparently no degree.

The great cost to the religious communities that sponsor these colleges is

underscored by the faculty-student ratio (excluding the 3 comparatively large, regionally accredited colleges) of 1 teacher for each 3.6 students. The study concludes:

... the current great scarcity of well-qualified teaching staff at all levels of Catholic education makes it worth noting, also, that in these tiny colleges there are 358 persons holding advanced degrees, teaching only 2,032 students. This may be fully as important a consideration as the fact that these same students were being taught by 85 staff members who apparently had no degree at all.

What is our mandate in relationship to the education of religious? To complain about this unhealthy proliferation of small, almost certainly weak institutions helps no one unless some positive solution to the obligation of various communities to educate our sisters is proposed. The problem facing these congregations is a real one.

Religious commitment and quality in education can certainly be combined in one institution, but the presence of one of these factors does not necessarily presuppose the other. Since religious communities must ensure that both elements are present in the formation of their members, they should look to cooperation with colleges and universities conducted by other groups in the Church to procure educational excellence. Large colleges and universities should stand ready to share their resources with communities in such a way that the legitimate aims of the communities are not jeopardized. Such aims do exist, and they are not co-extensive with general academic aims. The fact that smaller institutions open to lay students sometimes protest that they cannot "absorb" sister students beyond a certain percentage points up that there is need for special planning for sisters and that they constitute an unmistakably unique element in a student community because of their consecration and specific apostolic commitment.

In themselves, neither smallness nor bigness can be appealed to as value in a school, apart from the total worth of an institution; nor can an institution be called weak merely because its entire student body consists of sisters. Both the academic institution and the religious community need to admit that sisters require formation in view of their vocation; and they should be willing to plan imaginatively and generously for cooperation and sharing of resources. Neither group can use the other to advance its own aims if this means anti-intellectualism on the one hand, or distrust of religious and spiritual objectives on the other. Neither group can engage in education which puts in hazard the standing of colleges and universities in the opinion of fair-minded secular persons qualified to judge; nor can either group afford to overlook the intrinsic importance of forming consecrated religious for an inestimable service in our society. These are the objectives which the Sister Formation Conference, a section of the College and University Department of this Association, is pursuing through its Educational Resources Committee, through NCEA programs, regional conferences, summer workshops, and publications.

b) There is equally alarming evidence of excessive, unplanned proliferation of new Catholic *colleges for lay students*. Since 1950, at least 54 new Catholic colleges for lay students have been established, 42 of them four-year institutions, and 12 junior colleges. Four additional senior colleges have announced that they will open in 1965.

Considering the tremendous problem of adequate staffing for these new institutions, it is clear that they should have been established only for

the very best and most cogent of reasons. Yet one frequently searches in vain for these compelling reasons. For example, it cannot be said that new colleges are being established with an eye to geographical distribution in order to meet the needs in areas that previously had no Catholic college. Twenty years ago there were 13 states which did not have even one senior Catholic college. In the twenty intervening years up to the present, only 2 of the 54 new Catholic colleges have been established in states which had no previous Catholic college, and only 2 other colleges have been opened up in areas remote from existing Catholic colleges. For the most part, these new colleges for lay students have been established in areas that are already reasonably well-supplied with Catholic higher education.

I share the sobering conviction of many that "one of the threats to the survival of all Catholic colleges of liberal arts is the alarming proliferation of new Catholic colleges at a time when the cost of operating these institutions has literally skyrocketed."¹ The initial cost of land and buildings is only a very minor part of the continuing financial investment required if a quality education worthy of our Catholic institutions is to be guaranteed. Most of this money must come from Catholic sources, and there has to be a limit somewhere. Today, one hears a growing insistence on the part of Catholic philanthropists that the appeal for funds for Catholic higher education is doomed to fall on deaf ears unless evidence is forthcoming that the hierarchy, religious communities, and others responsible for the establishment of new Catholic institutions are guided by a carefully developed plan aimed at meeting the most critical needs of the Catholic population of this country, at meeting these critical needs with the maximum use of our limited resources in manpower and facilities, and with such ingenious methods of collaboration, coordination, and cooperation as have been developed by other segments of American higher education.

SECOND MANDATE

If we are to maintain and enhance the quality of Catholic higher education, we must heed a second mandate, namely, that of providing faculties composed of dedicated, effective teachers and first-rate scholars in all of the academic curricula offered by the institution. In carrying out this mandate today, certain specific steps are essential:

a) In the case of our religious teachers—priests, sisters, and brothers—we must provide for them the academic training and the opportunities for professional development that are comparable to the scholar-teachers in the nation's other private and public colleges and universities. These religious men and women must be encouraged to devote themselves to fields which are studied for their own sake in order to promote the advancement of human knowledge. In her illuminating article "Toward the Open College,"² Sister Helen James John speaks cogently to this point:

The biologist who has worked for years to grasp the scientific evidence of evolution; the historian who has come to a sympathetic understanding of the mind of Luther or Marx; the economist who day by day sees the grim facts of human necessity in the light of Christian responsibility; the teacher of creative writing who can bring to fully formed expression the beauty and tragedy of a world charged with the grandeur of God:—these are masters whose vision the student can make his own, in whom he can see the reality of his own half-formed aspirations.

b) This mandate affecting the religious members of our faculties demands greater attention than ever before on the two academic disciplines which constitute our specific difference from a curricular viewpoint—philosophy and theology. The insistent need for excellence in these departments in our Catholic institutions stems from “the need which every educated and intellectually self-aware human person has to be able to make certain basic, ultimate, and genuinely intellectual commitments about the ultimate truth of things, specifically about his own nature as a human person, about the goals and values which must ultimately determine his life and his attitudes toward it, about the nature of the world and the social order, and especially about the God who is (or is not) the one source Who gives meaning and intelligibility and purpose to all of reality.”³ There is ample evidence to show that these needs of our students are often not being met by priests, sisters, or brothers in our departments of philosophy and theology, because they have not been given professional training comparable to that expected of their confreres in the secular disciplines. Fortunately, doctoral programs in both philosophy and theology already exist, and others are being established in some of our Catholic universities. The notion that the ordinary training common to all priests and religious is adequate for a college-level teaching of philosophy and theology must be abandoned forever. These subjects must be taught by men and women who have penetrated the intellectual core of Christian wisdom, and who can foster the mental formation of our students in such a way that these academic disciplines will contribute to the intellectual as well as to the moral and spiritual growth of our students.

c) Another facet of the mandate relating to our faculties is that of strategic placement of our religious teachers. Since it is obvious that all Catholic colleges and universities neither can nor should be staffed entirely by religious, the placement of limited manpower resources within the institution is a matter of great importance. Efforts should be made even in the largest institutions to have at least one well-trained religious scholar in each department, a heavy concentration of religious in theology and philosophy, a substantial representation in the humanities, social sciences, and education, and a smaller representation in the fields of natural sciences, business, engineering, and the professional curricula of law, dentistry, and medicine. Strategic placement in these crucial areas or courses should produce the greatest impact on both the lay faculty and our student bodies. One well-trained religious scholar in any given department, a colleague esteemed by his or her lay confreres in their area of academic competence, will be a better guarantee of the penetrating influence of Christian educational philosophy in that department than a large number of inadequately prepared religious teachers.

d) The mandate for first-rate faculties also postulates a much wider and deeper involvement of our lay faculty and personnel. The shortage of competent and well-trained religious in our colleges and universities makes this involvement not only a necessity but an advantage as well. Although the participation of our lay confreres is rapidly growing in the instructional and research activities of our colleges and universities, several additional important fields of endeavor must be opened to them. Lay as well as religious professors should be encouraged to take advantage of the doctoral programs in theology so that they may soon be in a position to make a major contribution to the academic life of our departments of theology as some of them are already doing in philosophy. Likewise, lay men and women must be placed in strategic administrative positions where they, together with the

total faculty, can have an influential voice in determining academic policy. Another neglected field where lay men and women can greatly alleviate our manpower problem is that of the co-curricular and extra-curricular life of the college. Lay personnel, professionally trained in counseling and student personnel work, should be given every opportunity to devote their talents to the student life programs on our campuses.

THIRD MANDATE

The third mandate requisite to the enhancement of the quality of our educational efforts requires greatly expanded educational opportunities for our students. This mandate, too, has a number of very practical implications:

a) Catholic colleges and universities must exert a more intelligent effort in seeking and admitting the "right" student. In other words, we must keep in step with the improved admissions procedures in superior colleges and universities. Admissions in our better colleges are being based more and more on the relation of the student's interests, abilities, and aptitudes to the specific type and objectives of the individual institution itself. This makes more sense than the monolithic process of selecting students on the high school record and on one or more aptitude tests which are incapable of taking into consideration the kind of institution and curriculum involved. While we are all institutions under Catholic auspices, it is obvious that each of our colleges and universities should be conscious of a clearly defined specific role to be played within the total spectrum of Catholic higher education. Having identified these specific objectives, we should proceed to recruit only those students who are interested in achieving these specific objectives, who are academically capable of the demands these specific objectives entail, and who are motivated to make the most of the opportunities offered. In the words of Alvin C. Eurich of the Fund For the Advancement of Education, the admissions officer today must "look both to the past and to the future, rather than being concerned with a snapshot judgment of the present. He must perceive the pattern of each individual's growth in his past education, and he must understand the educational program of his own institution intimately enough to see how the student's record and achievement profile can interlock with the institution's offerings." ⁴

b) Our colleges and universities must provide increased financial assistance in the form of scholarships, grants-in-aid, and loans to the qualified needy student. Unlike past practice in too many Catholic colleges, this financial assistance must be funded, not merely written off. This means that a financial aid program for students must be devised consonant both with the institution's educational objectives and its financial potential. Financial-aid officers must be perceptive enough to face the peculiar situation of each applicant, not with an unvarying routine or formula but with individualized treatment. The need analysis of the College Scholarship Service should be used as a helpful guide, not as a rigid scientific law. Professor Fredrick Rudolph of Williams College, addressing the first colloquium on financial aid to the College Scholarship Service, said: "Higher education in the United States has always been untidy; it will probably never be an orderly house. Surely, however, it has now reached a point where it can take a responsible inventory of its resources for student aid, make some effort to understand their historical and philosophical foundations and tendencies, and undertake a new and bold adventure in subsidies for wisdom, investments in democracy." ⁵

c) Our faculties must exert greater effort and ingenuity in discharging our obligation to the most capable students in our institutions. What is each of us doing in an organized, adequately financed program to motivate highly talented students to achieve their potential for excellence? Much can be learned from the wide variety of successful plans now in operation in some of our Catholic colleges and universities. Though it is impossible to mention them all, let me list just a few which can be considered significantly representative: Boston College, San Francisco College for Women, Mundelein College (Chicago), Xavier University (Cincinnati), Fordham University, St. Michael's College (Vermont), University of Santa Clara, Providence College, Notre Dame, and Saint Louis University. One evidence of the effectiveness of this type of program in these institutions is the large number of graduate fellowships and assistantships, the prizes, and other awards which the talented students in these programs are receiving annually.

d) In the light of the revolutionary developments in the liturgical life of the Christian, our students today have a right to demand that Catholic colleges and universities reassess the conduct of religious activities on our campus, those activities which presumably are part and parcel of our unique system of higher education, which professedly promote the Christian life and holiness of our students, and which specifically contribute to their moral, religious, and spiritual formation. Religious activities common to all institutions—the Mass, the sacraments, prayer, retreats and sodalities—should be centrally presided over by a trained chaplain or director of religious activities, assisted by a faculty committee charged with the responsibility of planning and supervising an integrated religious program for the entire academic year. The officer in charge of the religious activities should have a status and a stature in harmony with the high place this facet of student life holds among the goals of the institution. Such status and stature require a suitable staff, physical facilities, and a budget adequate for a full-blown religious program, including the attendance of both students and faculty at appropriate conventions, the inclusion of religious topics in institutional lecture series, public relations, and intra-institutional communications.

e) Much greater attention must also be given to the non-religious life of the student outside the classroom. Disillusioning experience has shown time and again that we cannot take it for granted that the principles taught in our classrooms will automatically be adopted by students outside the classroom. Father Walsh, president of Boston College, has written that there is "a gnawing body of evidence" which indicates that students themselves are just as likely to set the ethos of a campus as they are to adopt an institution-sponsored ethos, and that they are more apt to take their values from each other than from their professors and the administration. Catholic colleges and universities are well aware of the educational significance of religious activities on campus; they must be equally aware of the educational significance of non-religious activities. It should be the purpose of the non-religious program to develop students who may be trusted to conduct themselves among their peers with adequate Christian wisdom not only as students, but also through life as citizens in a free society. Most important are those extraclass activities which involve students themselves in the responsibilities which accompany the making of laws and the exercise of delegated authority. The full benefit of the non-religious activities program can be achieved only if it is structured to encourage the growth of personal and group responsibility. The total campus atmosphere

should be such as to provide opportunity for the development of leadership qualities in the student. Clear concepts with respect to the nature, necessity, and limits of authority can be taught and learned in the disciplines of philosophy and theology. But they will be worthless to our students if we, the responsible agents who exercise authority within our own institutions, do not do so with deep respect for the dignity, rights, freedoms, and degree of maturity which the individual student possesses.

FOURTH MANDATE

The fourth and final mandate for the enhancement of quality in our institutions of higher learning is the demand for stabilized financial support. Though this critical problem of financing has a multitude of facets, my observations regarding many Catholic colleges and universities has convinced me of four key requirements:

1. We must take a realistic position in respect to what we charge for our educational services. In our noble obsession down through the years to keep tuition at the very minimum, we blinded ourselves to the galloping imbalance between expenditures and income. With each new building, with each new faculty member, with each new student, our expenditures for general educational operations continue to climb. In spite of the fierce competitive position many of us may find ourselves in in regard to tax-supported institutions, we must continue to increase our tuition charges. At the same time we must educate our students and parents to their responsibility for bearing a fair share of the rapidly growing costs of higher education. If we are offering quality education, we are justified in tuition rates comparable to those in quality secular private colleges and universities. We are not being honest with our students if we allow the disproportion between tuition and the actual costs of instruction to undermine our traditions of educational superiority.

2. In addition to a substantial base of tuition support, we must establish in all our institutions a well-organized development program. No Catholic college can be satisfied that its future is secure until it has in operation a program of continuing voluntary support from corporations, foundations, individuals, alumni, parents, and students. Such support from multiple sources will be needed over and above the financial assistance from the federal government which hopefully will also increase in the years ahead. Religious as well as lay staff must be trained and dedicated to this recognized and respectable area of college and university life. To quote Father Stanford again: "Tackle first those tasks which are closest at hand—alumni annual giving, parent and student efforts. Then there are the activities where trustees and associate board members must help, solicitations from business and industrial corporations and the like. Finally, there are the longer-range programs which deal with special gifts, wills, bequests and the like. These require careful preparation and patient cultivation on the part of many selected individuals." ⁶

Fifteen years of educational fund-raising has convinced me that there are at least three essential ingredients, one or more of which is too often missing in the typical support program of our institutions: continuity, investment in manpower and money, and the help of volunteers. A program for support that operates in fits and starts due to changing institutional leadership is doomed to failure. Again, many development programs fail because those

responsible do not have sufficient faith in their efforts to make the necessary investment prerequisite to successful results. There is no other way. It costs money to raise money. Continuity of leadership together with willingness to invest still demands the invaluable advice and aid of lay volunteers. And laymen can advise and act with wisdom and power only if they are allowed to acquire an intimate knowledge of the college or university for which they are working. Better not to have an advisory board at all than to keep vital information to ourselves.

3. Another guarantee of financial stability should be the approach we take toward the construction and maintenance of our physical facilities. Today, there is no justification whatever for the erection of new buildings that are costly monuments, architect's dreams, yet ill-fitted to our total financial potential, to modern teaching techniques, and to economical maintenance and repair. It has been said, and so rightly, that master planning can be the best money higher education spends; and in planning, the watchword is *flexibility*—the optimum utilization of space and architectural design to accomplish this end. As Harold B. Gores of the Educational Facilities Laboratories aptly remarks in his *Bricks and Mortarboards*: "A college or university is people, ideas, and a place—and in that order. A college or university aspiring to completeness in all things will somehow find a way to cast up a physical environment that supports and sustains its mission."

4. Finally, financial stability for Catholic higher education must be fostered by ceaseless ingenious efforts to combine our resources both with other Catholic institutions and with secular colleges and universities. Inter-institutional cooperation is *the* emerging concept in American higher education. In non-Catholic circles it is proving itself capable of producing academic and cultural stimulation to the whole higher educational program. While thus far we Catholics are not conspicuous for leadership in this movement, at least there are many encouraging evidences of awareness of the potential and of courage to initiate one form or another of pooling of resources. Our more complex universities can strengthen themselves mightily in the graduate and professional fields by investigating seriously the promising possibilities of such arrangements as have been announced in Washington, D.C., where American, Catholic, Georgetown, George Washington, and Howard Universities have formed the Joint Graduate Consortium of Washington Universities by agreeing to pool their facilities for graduate students under one coordinator. Beginning next September, a graduate student enrolled at any one of these five universities will be able to take one or more courses at any of the other four universities. The degree will be awarded by the university in which he originally enrolled. A similar agreement in the field of graduate nursing has been achieved by Washington and Saint Louis Universities and we are currently exploring several other graduate academic programs in relation to which this agreement will be extended. Undergraduate education in all our colleges and universities may well be strengthened without additional financial burden, even possibly with great savings, if more of us are willing to shake off the shackles of isolationism as has been done, for example, in the St. Thomas-St. Catherine-Macalester-Hamline program in the Twin Cities area, which offers jointly an area-studies curriculum which previously was out of reach for any one of the four institutions. Fortunately, sound programs in which colleges and universities primarily for lay students are coordinating their faculties and facilities with programs for the education of religious teachers are multiplying. Before starting a new tiny college,

religious superiors should certainly investigate the Sister Formation programs now in progress, for example, at institutions in Milwaukee, Chicago, Seattle, and St. Louis.

To summarize: The responsibility of Catholic colleges and universities in meeting national needs today will be carried out with distinction only if we enhance the quality of the achievement of our unique objectives. Today this is possible only if, in expanding our services, we: 1) avoid unsound proliferation; 2) enhance the professional competence of our faculties both religious and lay; 3) enrich the educational opportunities of our students; and 4) stabilize our financial support. These four mandates should press heavily on each one of our institutions and on those of us who are responsible for their administration. I cannot conclude, however, without repeating what was said earlier. These four mandates imply a *fifth mandate* which demands more than any one or any small group of us can bring to realization: an objective, carefully prepared, flexible blueprint for the general development of Catholic higher education in this country. Obviously, this blueprint, if it did exist, should not be imposed by an authority within or outside our own colleges and universities. Ideally, it should be the result of our own voluntary efforts to accomplish what is obviously needed. Practically, it may be forced on us by the decision of those on whom all of us directly or indirectly depend—the benefactors, mostly Catholic, whose contributions are essential to our future growth and development. Before they move farther toward a unified refusal to support unplanned Catholic higher education, I would urge that we do what is overdue at once.

FOOTNOTES

1. STANFORD, EDWARD V., O.S.A. "Lessons Learned from Visiting Colleges." Speech delivered at Winter meeting, Eastern Regional Unit, National Catholic Educational Association, February 22, 1964, Villanova University.
2. JOHN, SISTER HELEN JAMES. "Toward the Open College." *Commonweal*, October 4, 1963.
3. "The Role of Philosophy and Theology as Academic Disciplines and the Integration with the Moral, Religious, and Spiritual Life of the Jesuit College Student." Workshop of the Jesuit Educational Association, Loyola in Los Angeles, August, 1962. (Selected papers from this workshop will be published by Sheed & Ward in September, 1964, in a volume titled "Christian Wisdom and Christian Formation.")
4. EURICH, ALVIN C. "College Admissions in the 21st Century." *College Board Review*, Fall, 1963.
5. RUDOLPH, FREDERICK. "Myths and Realities of Student Aid." *College Board Review*, Fall, 1962.
6. STANFORD, EDWARD V., O.S.A. *Catholic Educational Review*, 1961.
7. GORES, HAROLD B. "Bricks and Mortarboards." Conference on Higher Education, 1963.

The Realization of the Purposes of Catholic Education on the Catholic Campus

RT. REV. MSGR. ALFRED F. HERRIGAN

Bellarmino College, Louisville, Kentucky

YESTERDAY FATHER PAUL REINERT presented to this group his thesis that Catholic higher education has something unique to offer for the benefit of American society and that our responsibility today, in meeting national needs, is to improve the quality of that "something unique."

Searching questions are being asked about Catholic schools at all levels. Are they social institutions which have outlived their usefulness? Have the social, economic, and educational needs of the Age of Space and the Age of Vatican II been so radically altered that educational institutions adequate for a past age are no longer appropriate?

We are dealing here with a complex series of problems. It may be useful to note quickly several basic conclusions about which I think there is little likelihood of disagreement.

American Catholic higher education is passing through an extraordinary period of change because American society in general and the American Catholic community in particular are passing through such a period of change. The immediate preoccupations of Catholic institutions of higher learning cannot be the same today as they were in the nineteenth century. There is some exaggeration in the casual and frequently made statement that the American Catholic college was founded primarily as a device to shield Catholic youth from dangerous exposure to Protestant and secularistic influences in American culture and educational life. In any event, the narrowly protective function of the Catholic college no longer expresses in any substantial degree its understanding of its own mission.

Everyone is also aware, of course, of the shifting quantitative scope of American Catholic higher education. I presume that no one ever seriously entertained the hope that the principle "every Catholic child in a Catholic school" could be applied at the level of higher education. The majority of Catholic young people today are receiving their higher education on non-Catholic college campuses, and this percentage without doubt will increase steadily in the years ahead. We are confronted here with certain irreversible facts of population growth, economics, and logistics.

Having stipulated, therefore, that we are passing through a period of drastic change in regard to the immediate social purposes of Catholic higher education and the statistical scope, are we obliged to entertain misgivings about the essential purposes and relevance of the institutions themselves?

I suggest that the sum total of changes and new demands of our age enhance rather than diminish the importance of the traditional Catholic campus. The educational requirements of our day can be met fully only by a vast array of institutions, among which our schools are only a single element. (There is always a need for professional educators, Catholic and otherwise, to remind themselves that "schooling" and "education" are not coextensive

terms.) Catholic colleges and universities must free themselves of provincial limitations of view and recognize that in the future Catholic higher education on a vast and vital scale will be going forward on secular campuses, in community centers, in adult education programs, and, it is hoped, in an array of entirely new and imaginatively conceived forms and institutions proportionate to the needs of our times. But there will remain a constant need for Catholic colleges and universities to make—not merely for the sake of their own students, but for the well-being of the total American community—the unique and indispensable contribution which only they can make.

This is not the place to attempt one more summary of the first principles of the Catholic philosophy of education. Our need is satisfied for the moment, I think, by an insistent reminder that the justification and the glory of the Catholic campus are found in the fact that here the ultimate questions of human existence can be pursued in the light of the full resources of both divine revelation and human reason. Here a community of scholars is free and committed to seeking an integration of divine and human wisdom and, by so doing, to offer to their society a gift of unlimited value. The mission of service of the Catholic college is, in the nature of the case, as wide as the human quest for truth.

Is the church-related college a desirable instrument for preparing Catholic youth to cope with the new pluralism of our age? Is it possible that the Catholic campus may be one more outdated form of the Catholic ghetto which in so many other guises is now happily diminishing in significance in American life?

In considering these questions, let it be recalled that devotion to the values of the church-related college is a deeply rooted American tradition which always has been cherished in the Protestant as well as in the Catholic community. One well might argue that this tradition has been one of the most effective bonds of unity and communication between American Protestants and Catholics. Rather than operating as a divisive influence, the church-related colleges, and the many activities and associations which they have promoted, have served most effectively to bridge many gaps of misunderstanding and cultural separatism.

In a recent article in *America*, Professor Philip Gleason of Notre Dame discusses the basic question of whether individuals or groups are the critical units in the pluralistic society. He warns against the danger of concentrating upon only the individualistic brand of pluralism. He speaks of the confusion we now have, "where one man's pluralism is another's ghettoism and a new pluralism can be mistaken for an old monism."¹

Father Andrew Greeley and Dr. Peter Rossi also have addressed themselves to the same issue. They write:

We cannot help but feel that the function of Catholic schools to integrate Catholics into the American Catholic community is extremely important, especially since people can operate well in the large society only if they have some security in their "belonging" in a lesser community. Thus we suspect that the alternative of "Catholic ghetto" or "open society" is a false one, and that the Catholic who can participate most fully as a Catholic in the open society is one who is quite secure in his own Catholicism and is a well integrated member of the Catholic community.²

These are questions which need patient and careful investigation. They

merit our attention at the moment as reminders of how little empirical evidence can be mustered in support of the facile generalizations found in such profusion these days on the subject of the dangerous divisiveness and separatist tendencies of church-related schools at whatever level.

As Father Reinert so effectively pointed out in his paper yesterday, the Catholic college will discharge its responsibilities to its own students, to Catholic students and professors on non-Catholic campuses, to the American Catholic community, and to American society as a whole, only by fulfilling its unique functions in a truly distinguished fashion. In discussing the problems of quality Father Reinert properly gave major attention to the multiplication of Catholic colleges and the necessity of better coordinated effort in the whole enterprise of Catholic higher education.

Clearly, Catholic higher education must restrict its growth lest it reach a point of proliferation where quality is seriously impaired. Inferior, sub-standard institutions, new or old, which lack a clear set of objectives and the resources to realize these objectives, are obviously a liability rather than an asset to the Church and the general community. I am not sure, however, that these premises automatically justify the conclusion that there should be a more or less indefinite moratorium upon the establishment of new Catholic institutions of higher learning.

We now are moving into the greatest period of expansion in the history of American higher education. There is a dazzling array of new problems and challenges to be met. In such a period of dynamic growth and new opportunity I personally would find it unexpected and disappointing if, in contrast to all periods in the past, there would be no new, imaginative responses from Catholic higher education to the needs of the times.

One weakness, for example, of our present higher education establishment is the lack of variety in purposes and programs. There is a depressing synoptic aspect about too many of our college catalogues. There is room and even some necessity for experiments with new types of postsecondary school institutions. The growing importance of the community college concept is certainly not without interest and responsibility for Catholic educators.

To cite another example, I think it is regrettable that we have in this country no Catholic institutions of higher learning under full lay control. The sponsoring and controlling agencies of all of our existing institutions are either religious communities or dioceses. While the role of the laity in our Catholic colleges and universities has become increasingly important with every passing year, there are inherent limits to the degree of final responsibility which can be delegated by a religious community or diocese conducting a college or university.

I see no convincing reason why the personnel and the financial support could not be found within the next decade to establish, say, half a dozen first-rate Catholic colleges in judiciously selected areas of the country which would be altogether under lay control and administration. They would add a stimulating and valuable new dimension to Catholic higher education in this country. I am not at all unaware of the problems to be met in the course of establishing a new college. At the same time, I repeat the conviction that both the resources and the leadership exist for the undertaking which I propose if all the necessary forces can be set harmoniously in motion. Without undertakings of this character, the emergence of the layman in Catholic higher education well may remain an incomplete and frustrating phenomenon.

Father Reinert effectively developed the point that the quality of our

efforts in Catholic higher education must continue to improve if we are to meet our national responsibility at this time. Without minimizing the problems and needs which continue to loom up before us, there is satisfaction in looking back to estimate the progress which has been made in Catholic higher education in the period following World War II. Without question, this has been an extraordinary period not merely of quantitative expansion but of fruitful dedication to strengthened standards of instruction and facilities in every respect. There is observable in our midst today a preoccupation with what is generally called a commitment to excellence.

I do not question, of course, the value or appropriateness of this commitment, but it is our place to be on guard against some quite real dangers involved. Dr. Earl J. McGrath recently wrote:

In our time few terms in the English language have become a shibboleth more quickly than the word "excellence"—and fewer have been invested with more confused meanings. Excellence is now the sanctified phrase in every liturgy of higher education. Yet as the word is intoned in the temples of learning little actual educational change occurs. . . . The change which has commonly resulted from the preoccupation with excellence is of doubtful educational or social worth. Many colleges have been steadily raising admission standards and intensifying their competitive efforts to lure the exceptionally able student. . . .

. . . The large number of youth turned away, about which many institutions like to boast, or the number failed after they enter, may be a better indication of institutional incompetence and neglect than of effectiveness and social sensitivity.³

An article last summer in the Kiplinger Magazine *Changing Times* agrees that "excellence" is "the most widely used and abused word in education today." It deplores the currently popular definition of success which "presumably comes when a college can proudly boast in a press release that it, too, receives far more applications than it can possibly accept."⁴

The period of searching self-examination which Catholic higher education has gone through in the past decade has had its bizarre features, but on the whole it has served us very well. The important thing at this juncture, it seems to me, is that we do not permit our intensified concern with quality to wander off into eccentric and snobbish bypaths or to infect us with the viruses of "projectitis" acquired through overexposure to five-color foundation brochures. We will neither serve the cause of Catholic education nor play our part in filling national needs by assuming a mission to concentrate our efforts exclusively upon some kind of alleged elite group. The lot of our admissions officers in the years to come will not be an enviable one. But let it be agreed that the rich variety of our responsibilities and opportunities certainly cannot be measured merely by a College Board score or any other single gimmick or device which is offered as a predictor of success in college and achievement in adult life.

Finally, I wish to suggest that the Catholic campus of tomorrow must play an indispensably important role in the communication, interpretation, and implementation of the decrees and directives of the Second Vatican Council. Under the impact of the Council and the historical convergence of a variety of contemporary intellectual and spiritual movements, we are witnessing an explosion of theological knowledge which properly can be compared to the expansion of scientific knowledge which has transformed our age.

The country now is dotted with summer institutes training science and mathematics teachers to deal with the new knowledge and methods in their

fields. We frankly acknowledge the need of reeducation for anyone who for any length of time has been out of contact with latest developments in his area of teaching. If we are to be equal to the challenge of the Age of Vatican II, there must be undertaken a vast program of education and reeducation for clergy, religious, and laity. In the nature of the case, the greater part of the responsibility for this effort must be borne by our Catholic colleges and universities.

We need an unprecedented expansion in adult education activities. We need to develop strong undergraduate majors or programs of concentration in theology and religious education for both lay and religious students. We need strong new graduate programs in theology and religious education in all regions of the country. Priests, laity, and religious alike need the aid of these programs if they are to deal satisfactorily with the enormous array of new tasks and responsibilities that this Age of Vatican II will impose upon them.

The scope of these new undergraduate and graduate programs of study can be indicated simply by citing some of the areas in which greatly increased new knowledge and competence will be expected of the educated, mature Catholic of tomorrow. There are the liturgical and catechetical apostolates; the revolutionary new developments in the field of biblical scholarship; the demands and opportunities of the ecumenical movement; the challenging array of problems presented by the application of the principles of Christian social philosophy to such matters as international peace, disarmament, inter-racial justice, foreign aid, labor-management relations, and the worldwide crusade against poverty, ignorance, and disease. One, also, could cite the exciting new fields for study and action involved in such topics as the new role of the layman; changing patterns of clergy-lay relations; the marriage and the family apostolate; the changing role of women in society, with all its implications for both family and religious life; and the host of problems usually grouped under the head of church-state relations.

In summary, then, I suggest that our changing times and the demands that they bring are presenting an intensified rather than a diminishing need for the distinctive contribution of the Catholic college and university. These institutions must recognize themselves as only one of the Church's many educational agencies, and, without provincialism or institutional self-centeredness, must cooperate in the broadest possible ways with all other agencies to meet the needs of both the Church and the national community in these critical times. Our American Catholic higher education establishment must not dissipate its resources in ill-considered and trifling efforts at expansion which merely will deplete its resources. On the other hand, it must suffer no loss of nerve and it must not refrain from imaginative and promising new ventures when circumstances dictate.

It need have no self-consciousness about its rightful place in a society rejoicing in the development of a rich, new pluralism. Its unique function cannot be fulfilled by other types of educational institutions or arrangements, no matter how useful these institutions or arrangements may be for their own purposes. The Catholic campus is not a ghetto, but a center of intellectual and moral strength for the total community. It will be true to itself in constructing its own definition of excellence, and in so doing will be false to no man or worthy cause in our society.

FOOTNOTES

1. GLEASON, PHILIP. "Pluralism and the New Pluralism," *America*, March 7, 1964, pp. 308-12.
2. GREELEY, REV. ANDREW, and PETER ROSSI, "The Effects of Catholic Education," *The Critic*, December 1963-January 1964, pp. 34-38.
3. MCGRATH, EARL J., *Eisenhower College: An Adventure in College Education* (Seneca Falls, N.Y.; November 1963, pp. 5-6.)
4. "Chaos in College Admissions," *Changing Times*, The Kiplinger Magazine, August 1963.

The Cultural Contribution of the Newman Apostolate to Secular Higher Education

REV. RICHARD E. BUTLER, O.P.

*President, National Newman Chaplains Association,
Chicago, Illinois*

SOME OF YOU MAY THINK that the title of my address is rather pretentious. I am talking about a "cultural contribution" rather than the "protection and preservation of Catholic faith in secular colleges and universities." And I am avoiding, deliberately, the expression that I am sure is more familiar to you: "Newman Club."

There was a time, not very long ago—and, frankly, the situation is still prevalent in the majority of these schools—when this Newman organization was merely a club, often with all the second-rate, social significance implied by that old-fashioned, ghetto-inferred word. Until this generation—what Michael Novak calls "A New Generation, American and Catholic"—Catholics constituted a minority, almost fringe, group, isolated and insulated from the mainstream of American society, huddling together for mutual protection and "the preservation of the Holy Faith."

Times have changed, and so have the conditions, thanks be to God and, if I may be very Thomistic, to secondary causes such as the two Johns—the twenty-third of the Church and the thirty-fifth head of State—Vatican Council II, and the inevitable and irrepressible march of history. We must face the facts, the statistics, the unavoidable and awful (mark that word "awful") truth of the present situation of Catholics in higher education and the future prospects. I will tell you what the Newman Apostolate is trying to do about them, what the Church and *all of us* are trying to do to affect and influence the cultural transitions of higher education in this year and years to come.

You are well aware of the current rise in student enrollment in the colleges and universities. And you know what to expect in the near future. Between 1960 and 1985: almost double the number of college-age students in the national population boom; and almost twice as many in that age bracket (18 to 24) going to college.

With the rising costs of both building and maintenance (with which you are painfully familiar) and, therefore, the necessarily steady increase in tuition and other costs in all schools, the proportion of Catholic students going into the less expensive, tax-supported schools of higher learning will also rise steadily.

According to a Ford Foundation-sponsored study, whereas in 1960, 42 percent of all college students were in private schools, by 1985 only 20 percent of them will be in these schools and 80 percent will be enrolled in public—state or municipal—colleges and universities. By projection, considering the present ratio of twice as many Catholic students in secular colleges as those in Catholic colleges, along with the present 23 percent of Catholics in the population, we can expect that ratio to rise to 4 to 1 by 1985. We now have over 700,000 Catholics in these schools this year; we can expect 1,000,000 by 1970 and more than 2,000,000 by 1985.

The indisputable fact is that we have more Catholic students in secular colleges and universities than we have in our Catholic schools of higher learning. And we will have an even greater majority there in the future, year by year.

"By what curious logic," asked Archbishop Paul J. Hallinan of Atlanta of this assembly last year, "have we omitted [these students] for so many decades as the legitimate concern of Catholic education?" They "are Catholics" and "they are engaged in the process of learning at the level of higher education," as he so simply but effectively pointed out.

They are there, most of them, for a single and sound reason: money. And for those engaged in the daily struggle for economic security, in some cases survival, money is a compelling reason for adjusting to, not compromising with, the conditions of the secular society in which we live and breathe and have our well-being.

THE CULTURAL CRISIS

My concern is the cultural implications of the facts and figures. The higher education boom affects our cultural patterns in America, and the Church *must be* very concerned with the shape and form and direction of American culture in which, and through which, she exercises her apostolic ministry to the faithful, and to the unfaithful as well.

In 1900, 4 percent of American high-school graduates entered college; in 1963 over 60 percent went on to college. And recently Secretary of Labor Wirtz proposed raising the compulsory school attendance age to eighteen. Our national educational policy seems to be, indiscriminately and improvidentially, to provide more and more education for more and more people. The problem of quantity diminishing quality is inevitable.

"Never in the history of the world," writes *Time* editor Thomas Griffin, in *The Waist High Culture*, "have so many people had a college education, and never perhaps has there been such a proliferation of the second-rate. The trouble in education was once that too few could enjoy it; but such hardship may in time prove the less disastrous to society than to have people educated to the belief that they are not ignorant, and too complacent to know—as the ignorant once knew—that they are missing something."

There is always something missing, no matter how few are aware of the loss, in a wholly secular education. Missing are the revealed truths, the veridical philosophical principles and the firm moral values which ennoble man

—in Christian life even *transform* him—and provide him with a recognition of his own dignity and his transcendent destiny.

In its 40th anniversary issue, *Time* magazine published an excellent cultural commentary called "The Individual in American Society," and concluded with this observation: "Ultimately, the individual can see himself only in the eyes of others—and can see himself great or free only in the reflection of the eye of God. All past attempts to assert the worth of the individual without measuring him against a higher cause have failed, have in the end only diminished him. . . . 'If it were not for the religious element,' says Hocking, 'individualism would spell chaos.'"

When the religious element of culture is missing, or neutralized to a point of ineffectiveness, then we are faced with what Christopher Dawson calls "a sort of social schizophrenia which divides the soul of society between a non-moral will to power served by inhuman techniques, and a religious faith and moral idealism which have no power to influence human life."

The Church's obligation in education, as the rich source and divinely delegated depository of these essential cultural elements, is to transmit this cultural heritage of her life and her thought—not only to her own children but to all who seek the broader dimensions and the more profound depths of knowledge, of meaning, and of purpose—both personally and socially.

Dawson again, in another context: ". . . in the modern world there is a . . . tradition of sacred culture which it has been the mission of the Church to nourish and preserve. However secularized our modern civilization may become this sacred tradition remains like a river in the desert, and a genuine religious education can still use it to irrigate the thirsty lands and to change the face of the world with the promise of new life."

Can I invoke any higher authority in the Church on this crucial point? The present pontiff, Pope Paul VI, has said: "The mission of the Church is to relate the secular and the sacred, so that the second will not be contaminated but communicated, and the first will not be adulterated but sanctified."

To such a mission—the communication of the sacred and the sanctification of the secular—the Newman Apostolate is committed, and always has been.

THE CULTURAL CONCERN OF THE NEWMAN APOSTOLATE: THE EARLY YEARS

Despite some trends of development over the years and misplaced emphases in particular instances in the recent past, the Newman movement began with broad cultural concerns—not a narrow, negative, and merely preservative religious intent—and this aim of infusing Christian culture into secular higher education has always been its primary purpose.

At the very beginning, in 1893, when the first "Newman Club" was formed at the University of Pennsylvania, one of the first officers described its two-fold aspect as:

negatively, not "to make us clannish or narrow us in a religious sense"; *positively*, "it is our purpose to have eminent Catholic lecturers, particularly graduates of the University, address us."

hopefully, he added: "It is bound to improve us mentally, spiritually and socially."

The first few meetings of this original organization concentrated on educational programs and featured lectures by Dr. J. Roberts Bryan, Pennsylvania class of 1888, Father P. J. Garvey, rector of St. James Church in Philadelphia and first chaplain to the University group, and Father James P. Laughlin, D.D., chancellor of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

The following year the Newman Club of the University of Pennsylvania sponsored a lecture by the Rt. Rev. John J. Keane, then rector of the Catholic University of America and later Archbishop of Dubuque. He spoke in the University Chapel, before a large assembly of students and faculty members, on "The Outcome of Philosophic Thought," a defense of scholastic philosophy. (Interestingly, and this is an aspect of Newman work which has never changed, the club had only \$4.50 in its treasury and members took up a collection among themselves to raise a fifty-dollar honorarium.)

The early 1900's were struggling years for this ambitious but small and relatively insignificant organization. Yet the Newman idea, so clearly based on the principal educational ideas of its holy and scholarly patron, took root and spread, first along the Eastern Seaboard and in the Midwest, then across the country to become, in 1938, a National Newman Federation. But even before 1920, accredited courses in Catholic thought were established at the University of Texas and at the University of Illinois. The Newman movement continued its cultural direction as it moved toward formal religious education in the secular schools of higher learning.

At an early stage of development, the College and University Department of this association recognized the fact of growing numbers of Catholic students in secular colleges and universities and the educational implications of this direction.

In the 1906 convention, Father Francis B. Cassilly, S.J., then vice president of St. Ignatius College of Chicago, presented a paper offering possible plans of educational cooperation with, he said, "the idea of calling attention to a new phase of educational conditions."

In the 1907 convention, Father John F. Farrell, Harvard chaplain, spoke on the subject, "The Catholic Chaplain at the Secular University." His own national survey, taken that year, showed the "alarming number" of 8,671 Catholic students attending secular schools of higher learning in the United States. In the heated discussion which followed, Father C. J. Meyer, S.J., strongly opposed the "deplorable fact" of so many Catholics in these schools, quoting the Archbishop of New York disapproving "fraternization" with secular educators and protesting "the establishment of halls and chapels and libraries, with frequent lectures and conferences, on the university grounds, or in connection with the university." (This last quotation certainly indicates a cultural character to Newman organizations at this time.)

During the twenties, Father John A. O'Brien had to defend his establishment of the Newman Foundation as an accredited school of religion at the University of Illinois. His debates with Catholic school educators reached a feverish pitch in the pages of *America* magazine in 1925, prompting the editors themselves to voice their disapproval of what they called an "undue extension of the Newman Club idea into the educational field of those institutions." Archbishop Michael J. Curley went so far as to charge Father O'Brien's supporters with "waging a secret hypocritical warfare against the best interests of the Church in America."

It took a long time to lay the ghost of the fear (in historical context, an understandable fear) of any semblance of religious, cultural, and educational compromise. I was here in Atlantic City nearly a decade ago when

the present Bishop of Baton Rouge, then National Newman Chaplain, was pleading the educational cause of Newman incorporation into this section of the NCEA to the resisting ears of one of my own religious confreres who was then president of the section. But time marches on and so does the course of history, with its changing patterns and designs: 8,000 Catholic students in secular higher education in 1907, 700,000 in 1964, a million in 1970? We must face the facts, the cultural implications, the future of Catholics in higher education in America, the future of the Church in America—together.

THE CULTURAL CONCERN OF THE NEWMAN APOSTOLATE: TODAY AND TOMORROW

How is this Newman organization doing today in discharging its own obligations, in fulfilling its ambitious aims of educating and forming Catholic students on secular campuses, of making cultural contributions to the colleges and universities they serve?

Are Newman groups so many haphazard patches on a quilt of educational expediency: saving the saved, losing the lost and the wavering as well, catering to a few club-minded rejects from other campus organizations, fighting a losing battle against overwhelming odds, a frantic and frustrating finger-in-the-dyke operation?

Some of our critics would have you think so; they are the ever-present the "ship is sinking" alarmists in the Church who speak glibly and superficially, and, unfortunately, too often, with no depth or range of experience with the situation.

We have a long way to go. And our defects show glaringly beneath the skirt of our noble aspirations. It's true, if you want to count heads and houses: only 235 of our 925 chaplains are working on the job full time—1 to every 3,092 Catholic students on the secular campuses as compared to 1 priest or religious for every 40 students on Catholic campuses; only 175 permanent or temporary Newman buildings, centers or houses, adjacent to the colleges and universities we serve. And many, largely because of this lack of facilities and personnel, offer a poor, patchwork program.

But we have come a long way, and especially during this past decade of progress and promise when facilities and full-time priest personnel has doubled. And priest personnel is not the only kind. Lay volunteers are increasing on the staffs of Newman Foundations (three times as many this year as last year). Sisters are in the work now (twice as many assigned to Newman Centers for next year as there were this year). Brothers, too, are at the inquiring stage of this challenging new frontier of Catholic education.

No longer are we merely a federation of clubs. By episcopal mandate in 1962 we are now the National Newman Apostolate, coordinating six organizations: students, chaplains, faculty and staff, alumni, members of the John Henry Newman Honor Society, and members of the National Newman Foundation. The last mentioned was recently established by the bishops of the United States to raise and distribute funds nationally for this urgently demanding work of the Church.

In a survey—made as long ago as 1961 (for time hurries by and progress is now rapid in this apostolic work)—251 chaplains reported that 30 of their schools (20 state schools and 10 private institutions) offered courses for credit in Catholic thought. I am sure that if the rest of the 925 chap-

lains had responded, the figure would have been double that number, probably more at this time, three years later.

Some of these courses are part of a school of religion within the university (University of Iowa, University of Kansas); some are chairs of Catholic studies (Harvard, Yale); some are Newman Foundations, recognized as educational institutions and directly accredited by the university (University of Illinois); some allow for indirect accreditation through extension cooperation with a Catholic school (Notre Dame and Purdue, Xavier College of Chicago and the University of New Mexico; next year, Loyola of Chicago and Northern Illinois University).

The more advanced Newman Foundations are developing special programs of study for their students, adapting both the content and method of the courses to the particular conditions of the secular academic scene. Liturgical life in a Newman chapel is as dynamic and congregation-involved as the expanding norms permit. Programs in leadership and apostolic formation are producing an already emerged laity to feed back not only to the campus immediately but to both parochial and professional life later on. Vocations to both sacerdotal and religious life, as well as to the lay apostolate, are astounding even the most zealous and sanguine chaplains.

Cultural contributions to the academic community take many and varied forms: Newman Forums arranged by a number of the larger Catholic centers bring prominent lecturers to campus auditoriums; seminars or conferences on philosophical and theological themes are often jointly sponsored by the school and the religious organizations serving it; Christian art exhibits, literature displays, book and periodical libraries, sacred concerts and dramatic productions, Newman reviews and annuals of scholastic merit—these are but a few of the specific cultural contributions directly made by the Newman Apostolate to secular higher education in America.

THE FINANCIAL INVESTMENT

Even culture has a price, a cost of building and maintenance, personnel and programming, as the sponsors of Lincoln Center in New York and the proposed National Cultural Center in Washington well know.

I had hoped to conduct a survey of American chancery offices to offer you an estimate of the Church's investment in the Newman Apostolate already made by most of the dioceses of this country. But the task was too ambitious to undertake at this busy time. And the figures would change rapidly because new Newman Foundations are rising every year, now at the rate of ten to fifteen a year.

Many of these buildings serving the larger universities are in the million-or-more class, such as the foundation completed last year at the University of Massachusetts and the one now under construction at New York University.

At least it is not an exaggeration to say that the diocesan investments in Newman Centers may some day in the near future equal, or even surpass, the investment already made by private Catholic institutions of higher learning. To speak of the strain this effort exerts on bishops, chaplains, parents, benefactors, alumni—even the undergraduates who do their fair share—would be a tale of woe oft-told in the hardy history of Catholic education in America.

THE ULTIMATE SYNTHESIS

What is ultimately desired by many of us in the Newman Apostolate is a fusion of sacred and secular culture—communicating the sacred and sanctifying the secular, yes, but going beyond to a higher synthesis of truth which not only satisfies the speculative mind with a unified culture but practically makes that culture relevant to life, to personal integrity and social responsibility. This is a sublime aspiration and involves an enormous educational task, but goals must go beyond the immediate and the expedient and we would be short-sighted pragmatists if we settled for less.

The days of division are over when we were almost driven into a false dichotomy between the truths of revelation and the truths of reason, faith, and science, religion and life. Religion cannot stifle or restrict the intellect, only enlighten and enlarge it. And the natural sciences would be stunted without the larger insights and firmer foundations of a metaphysical and theological orientation.

John Henry Newman, in a sermon preached in the University Church of Dublin in 1856, clearly described the synthesis we Catholic educators should strive to achieve, saying of the function of the Church in education:

. . . it is to reunite things which were in the beginning joined together by God, and have been put asunder by men. Some persons will say that I am thinking of confining, distorting, and stunting the growth of the intellect by ecclesiastical supervision. I have no such thought. Nor have I any thought of a compromise, as if religion must give up something and science something. I wish the intellect to range with the utmost freedom, and religion to enjoy as equal freedom; but what I am proposing is that they should be found in one and the same place, and exemplified in the same persons. . . . I wish the same spots and the same individuals to be at once oracles of philosophy and shrines of devotion. It will not satisfy me, what has satisfied so many, to have independent systems, intellectual and religious, going at once, side by side, by a sort of division of labour, and only accidentally brought together. It will not satisfy me if religion is here and science there, and students converse with science all day, and lodge with religion in the evening. . . . I want the same roof to contain both the intellectual and the moral disciplines.

CONCLUSION

The cultural contribution of the Newman Apostolate to higher education in America is as ample and as ambitious as the cultural contribution of the Church's college and universities. The essential difference is that our contribution can be made directly to the secular academic community in which we work as Catholic educators. While that circumstance has its obvious limitations, it also provides a unique opportunity for initial contact and eventual cultural conversion.

As one Catholic editor sees it:

Actually the pressures that are today influencing Catholics to the secular campuses may in the future be seen as a blessing in disguise. It has been noted that such giants of the American Church as Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland saw even in the last century the importance of Catholics absorbing the culture in which they live in order that the culture itself might "feel the yeast of the Gospels." But unless the multitudes of Catholic young people on secular campuses are reached with the "yeast" the expected yield may not be forthcoming.

Our hope, and our prayer, is that together, utilizing every means and every opportunity of cooperation, we Catholic educators in our colleges, our universities, and our Newman Centers, can provide that yeast and rejoice in the yield that we can and do expect through the providence of Almighty God.

Catholic Colleges and the Academic Facilities Bill of 1963

REV. ROBERT F. DRINAN, S.J.

Dean, Boston College Law School

IT HAS BEEN POINTED OUT by many historians of higher education in the United States that the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862 altered the character of American colleges and universities in a profound way. The Morrill Act, which in effect established the state universities as institutions primarily or at least predominantly devoted to the science of agriculture and the more pragmatic arts, was enormously influential in shifting the center of higher education in America away from the humanities and liberal arts to the technological and utilitarian sciences.

The Federal college-aid bill enacted in 1963 will almost certainly be as monumentally important as the Land-Grant bill enacted a century ago. For the first time in American history the Federal government has agreed to dispense grants to public and private colleges and universities. The formula by which such aid is granted is very similar to that adopted in 1958 when Congress, amid the nation's post-Sputnik panic, passed the National Defense Education Act. The College Facilities Act of 1963, like the NDEA, makes money available only for the construction of buildings designed for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages or engineering. The money available for library construction under the 1963 act is, however, a new development.

It is, of course, much too soon to know whether the obvious priority given by this Federal legislation to the practical sciences rather than to the liberal arts will have the same national impact as the Morrill Act of 1862. It seems clear, however, that the Federal government is now irreversibly involved in the financing of institutions of higher learning. If, furthermore, the history of Federal financing of highways, schools in Federally impacted areas, hospitals and any number of other projects is to be repeated, it would appear that the formula adopted in the 1963 Academic Facilities bill will be altered in any substantial way only with the greatest of difficulty.

Before coming to a discussion of some suggestions as to the new bill's potentialities and pitfalls for Catholic colleges and universities some key factors in the enactment of this law should be recalled.

It is well for all of us to be reminded that twenty-six senators, or over one-fourth of the U.S. Senate, voted to exclude *all* church-related colleges from any participation in Federal aid for higher education. It is likewise

well to recall that by a vote of 45 to 33 a provision authorizing judicial review of all grants or loans to Church-related colleges was passed by the Senate. This amendment—deleted by the conference committee—would have permitted any person to bring suit in a Federal court in the District of Columbia requesting a ruling on the constitutionality of an award in any state to a church-related college.

It is also wise for us to recall that influential voices and organizations will remain steadfast in their position that tax-financed aid to church-related colleges is unconstitutional—even if such aid is granted for secular purposes clearly unrelated to the religious function of such a college. All of us should remember that there is also a more sophisticated and probably a more serious threat to the church-related college in the attitude advanced by the American Civil Liberties Union and undoubtedly endorsed by a wide variety of individuals and groups. The ACLU would insist that before public money be given to church-related colleges these institutions must pass muster under the following three points:

- 1) Admit all students without regard to religion;
- 2) Require no course in theology or attendance at a religious exercise;
- 3) Place the control of the college in the hands of academic and not ecclesiastical officials.

It seems reasonably clear that the formulas of the NDEA on which the College Facilities bill of 1963 are based were designed deliberately to avoid and bypass any church-state difficulties. In fact, it may be fair to state that the needs sought to be met by the NDEA and the college aid bill of 1963 were satisfied by Congress in a way deemed to be consistent with the exigencies of the First Amendment and the separation of church and state in America. The great tragedy may be that the real needs of higher education may have been compromised by the widely held but dubiously valid assumption that tax support for secular purposes is unconstitutional if such support results in some incidental benefits to religion.

It also seems apparent that grants to Catholic colleges have been viewed by the Congress as posing a potential church-state problem more clearly than awards to any other type of church-related college or university. Catholic colleges, therefore, have had an undetermined but definite influence on the orientation of both the NDEA and the historic Academic Facilities bill of 1963. History may reveal that the existence of a large number of Catholic colleges—traditionally committed to giving priority to the liberal arts and the humanities—has paradoxically been instrumental in causing Congress to restrict Federal aid to the natural and physical sciences—areas in which there can presumably be no permeation of Catholic teaching.

Having indicated a few of the complex factors behind the recently enacted bill giving Federal aid to all colleges let us discuss three crucial questions regarding the attitude of Catholic educators towards this new phenomenon. These questions center on the following:

1. The legal considerations about Federal aid which Catholics should discuss and debate;
2. The strategy which Catholic officials should contemplate; and
3. The policies which Catholic educators should both adopt and avoid.

THE LAW AND AID TO PRIVATE COLLEGES

Catholic educators will be watching closely for any legal challenge to the participation of Catholic colleges in the distribution of the almost two billion dollars available through the college aid bill of 1963. The test case in Maryland challenging state grants to two Protestant and to two Catholic colleges is still in the lower courts but it seems clear that the plaintiffs in that case represent a broad coalition of most if not all of the forces that are opposed to any tax support for church-related colleges.

It seems unlikely that the Maryland case, whatever its result, will decide for all time the constitutionality of state aid to church-related colleges. If the highest court of Maryland rules that the challenged grants do not violate the constitution of Maryland it is questionable whether the United States Supreme Court could be persuaded to rule that they violate the Federal Constitution. If, on the other hand, Maryland decides that the awards in question violate the Maryland constitution, the United States Supreme Court would not reverse the decision of the highest court of a state when such decision is based on an interpretation of that state's constitution.

It is impossible to predict how or when the constitutionality of Federal aid to church-related colleges will be tested in the courts. The elimination of the judicial review amendment in the conference committee of Congress leaves intact the traditional tenet that a Federal taxpayer does not have the necessary standing to sue to challenge a Federal expenditure. It is possible, however, and perhaps probable, that a particular private college, denied a grant or loan under the 1963 college aid bill by the authorized state commission, could sue to challenge the constitutionality of the granting of an award to a church-related college. If this non-church-related college could demonstrate that but for the award to a religiously affiliated college it would have obtained a grant of Federal money, then clearly such a plaintiff has standing to sue.

In some way, it seems safe to predict, Federal aid to church-related colleges will be challenged. In view of this eventuality, what can we say about the law and the Constitution with regard to state aid for church-related colleges?

Whatever constitutional law exists on this subject is contained in the only decision ever rendered by the United States Supreme Court on tax support for religiously connected activities. The opinion, of course, is the *Everson* ruling of 1947 where the Supreme Court, in a 5 to 4 split, held that New Jersey could finance bus transportation to children attending Catholic schools. This precedent has not prevented the supreme courts of at least seven states from ruling that, despite *Everson*, under their own state constitutions bus transportation to Catholic schools was unconstitutional. If *Everson*, therefore, has been a confusing guideline for bus rides it offers even less guidance with regard to the constitutionality of Federal aid to Catholic colleges.

Many educators and jurists have tended to assume that tax support for specific secular purposes at church-related colleges is constitutionally unassailable. Assurances along this line were given by the Kennedy administration and by the brief of Mr. Ribicoff, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In this document the Administration urged these arguments, among others:

1. It would be unrealistic to help only public colleges since 41 percent of all students attend private colleges in America.

2. Those who attend a private, church-related college do so voluntarily and not because of compulsory school attendance laws; hence, tax support for these religiously affiliated colleges would not be adding the state's coercive power to assist religious training for students legally required to attend school.
3. A church-related college is less likely to "indoctrinate" its students in religion than a similar institution of less than collegiate rank.
4. The Federal government intends to give financial aid only for secular purposes unrelated to the religious function of a church-related college.

Catholics have not had occasion to examine these arguments very much since non-Catholic church-related colleges have been in the forefront of the struggle to get Federal aid for higher education. It appears to this observer, however, that the case or potential case for subsidies to religiously oriented colleges is actually *less* persuasive than the comparable case for church-related primary and secondary schools. Other observers might quite reasonably differ to some extent on this point but the thrust of the arguments deriving from the parental right to educate, the canons of distributive justice, and the "double taxation" contention do not have the same cogency at the college level as they do with regard to parochial schools.

Whatever one might think of the persuasiveness of the theoretical arguments for aid to the church-related colleges one must concede that there has not really been a great national debate on the matter and that aid to church-related colleges passed because there was a broad-based coalition of educators and church organizations which was more influential, or could control more votes, than the opposing alliance of those who would deny all Federal aid to church-related colleges. This power struggle is not likely to diminish and may possibly increase in intensity. It seems likely, also, that Catholic colleges more than non-Catholic church-related colleges are open to challenge and will in fact be challenged.

The key phrase in the whole matter of legality and constitutionality is, of course, "church-related." For the believer in *absolute* separation of church and state any degree of church-relatedness in an institution renders it constitutionally incapacitated to receive tax support. The argument underlying this absolutist position urges that any state support to the secular activities of a church-related group liberates the money of this sectarian body for other presumably religious purposes. Hence, state financing for a physics building would make the resources of a church-related college available for denominational objectives.

The full thrust of this argument leads one to the position that the state may not lend its prestige in any way to a church-related agency which seeks to carry out the secular purposes of the government. Such a logical but totally impractical conclusion is not really advanced by anyone; as in so many other areas of church-state concern, the practical and traditional realities of American life continue to flourish despite the fact that they are logically indefensible under the thesis advanced by the United States Supreme Court on several occasions that the state should be neutral as between religion and irreligion.

Catholics, therefore, must begin to think seriously about the ways in which a Catholic college is church-related. If any substantial type of "church-relatedness" eventually becomes a bar to the acquisition of Federal funds, many Protestant church-related colleges will have little difficulty in discontinuing certain traditional religious affiliations which are sometimes more symbols

than substance. Such a process would be much more difficult and perhaps really impossible for a Catholic college.

Although Catholics may eventually be required to restructure the church-relatedness of their colleges, the more affirmative and sounder policy for the present would seem to be to advance continuously the notion that the church-related college, even though it is committed to a body of truths, is still free to search and discover truth in all its forms. The designation of a college as church-related carries with it the suggestion that the *sole* purpose of the college is to advance the interests of the church with which it is connected. The pervasive feeling of so many non-Catholic educators that the church-related university is not really an institution free to search for truth cannot be dissipated in a brief period. But Catholics and others must continue to demonstrate that a university committed to Christianity is just as free—and, perhaps, more free—than the university which is committed only to being not committed.

STRATEGY WHICH CATHOLICS SHOULD CONSIDER

As one views the almost inevitable future legal and constitutional struggles over aid to Catholic colleges, one would have to be clairvoyant or very foolhardy to predict the ultimate result. At this moment of history one cannot tell whether American courts will follow rigidly the no-aid-to-religion doctrine and make the American state a secularistic nation or whether full religious freedom and true cultural pluralism will gradually emerge as one of the finest flowers of American jurisprudence.

It appears to be increasingly predictable that grants to Catholic educational institutions will sooner or later be litigated in the courts. If recent history can be a guide, Catholic institutions are likely to be involved in the wrong case at the wrong time and in the wrong place. It is a rule of rhetoric that he who frames the question has the debate half won. In recent legal controversies regarding religious practices in public schools and tax-supported bus rides for children attending Catholic schools, the plaintiffs have framed the questions, structured the record, and have, in general, been victorious over defendants who have been obliged to argue within a pre-established framework and in the context of an unfavorable fact situation.

There appears to be no simple way by which a Catholic college could bring the right case at the right time and in the right place. But all of us must realize how critically important the first or first few court decisions will be regarding the constitutionality of Federal grants to Catholic colleges. Local controversies can easily become national issues and the judgment of a local lawsuit can affect the climate of national thinking. It may well become necessary for Catholic leaders to agree to lose some battles in order to win the war. Total cooperation between the officials of *all* Catholic colleges and universities is more important now than ever before.

A second area where planning or strategy will be important for Catholics concerns the relationship which Catholic colleges will have with other private, church-related and public colleges and universities. It seems fair to say that Catholic colleges have been traditionally to some extent isolated from other private colleges. This isolation was given a legal and constitutional *coup de grâce* in the Academic Facilities bill of 1963 where complete equality and parity was given to *all* private and public institutions of higher learning.

Catholics should seek in every way to convert this juridical parity into

academic and social parity between Catholic and non-Catholic colleges. Catholic educators should explore with professors and administrative officials at non-Catholic colleges the common legal, moral, and constitutional bonds which unite *all* private colleges as institutions chartered by the state and empowered by it to confer academic degrees.

It is well known that the total enrollment of all private colleges will decrease within a decade or less from 41 percent of the college population to about 25 percent. At the same time many private church-related colleges will be phasing out their religious identification by adopting the label "non-denominational" or "unaffiliated with any religious body," or some other familiar form of disestablishment.

Catholics will almost inevitably be doing battle against the tendency toward a monopoly on higher education by state universities as well as against the secularization of post-Protestant colleges. In this struggle Catholics will hopefully find partners and allies among some Protestant officials and in the administrations of some non-Catholic colleges. There can be no doubt, however, that Catholic colleges are being isolated and set apart by the massive growth of state-operated universities and the rapid de-Christianization or secularization of post-Protestant colleges.

Such in briefest detail are but two of the many issues that confront Catholics regarding the strategy which they should adopt on issues involved in the Academic Facilities bill of 1963. The overall principle of strategy or tactics or collective behavior could perhaps be summed up by saying that Catholics should avoid every tendency which would result in Catholic colleges being virtually the only truly church-connected institutions of higher learning in the nation. The presence of this phenomenon among primary and secondary schools clearly renders the Catholic position on those levels more difficult. The fact that 92 percent of all children who attend private schools of less than collegiate rank are enrolled in Catholic institutions obviously makes it appear that any proposal to secure public aid for these schools is a bill to aid the Catholic Church and not private schools. It is to be hoped that a duplication of this situation may never occur in America at the collegiate level.

BASIC POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Neither future legal struggles nor contemplated strategy can compare in importance with the question regarding the fundamental policy which Catholic educators should take with respect to the provisions and the philosophy of the Academic Facilities bill of 1963.

Every advocate of Federal aid for higher education has been an opponent of that presumed evil called "Federal control." The elaborate provisions in the college aid bill of 1963 for relatively autonomous state commissions to allocate the Federal funds appropriated are designed, of course, to obviate the charge of Federal control. The Federal aid bill of 1963, however, controls thought far more than most commentators have realized. It does this by non-action, by omission, and by silence.

For the United States Congress to say in effect that instruction and research in the natural and physical sciences alone deserve Federal support is to imply and even to assert that the cold war has only secondary need of those trained in the humanities and the social sciences. For a variety of reasons it may be understandable that the first venture of the Federal

government in a massive way into the financing of higher education should give almost exclusive priority to the physical sciences. But, surely, the continuation of such a policy over a long period would serve to downgrade the humanities, attract some if not most of the more talented youth away from the social sciences, and, to some extent, make the nation's colleges servants of the government in its cold-war struggles.

Catholics and all educators should, therefore, continue to warn the Federal government and the nation of the long-range distortions of all education which will come about if the Federal government restricts its power and prestige to the physical sciences. In this connection, Catholics may have an awkward role to play because they will be suspected of acting out of self-interest and will even be accused of seeking public money for their own private and religious purposes.

Catholics must react to this situation with tact but with firmness. Catholics and all Christians must insist that when instruction is given in the liberal arts and the social sciences within a college with a commitment to Christianity, such instruction is just as worthy of state assistance as when it is imparted in a college with a commitment to non-committalism.

Indeed, philosophy and theology must be placed in this same category. If these subjects are taught in a objective, scientific way it is improper for the government to state that they are unworthy of the aid which would go to any subject which is competently taught as one of the arts and sciences.

Catholics, therefore, must develop a rationale which will reveal the implications of the current position of the Congress and of many individuals and groups that grants and loans to church-related colleges are constitutional only if they are given for secular purposes unrelated to the religious objectives of the church-related college. Such a policy by implication and even by assumption asserts that the social sciences and the humanities, as taught in a church-related college, are not entitled to that public support which they would receive if they were taught in a non-church-related institution. Such a policy clearly grants the status of a publicly recognized orthodoxy to the teaching of the liberal arts in a college committed only to secular learning and denies such status to the teaching of the same subjects when done in a fully accredited college or university which seeks to teach and interpret the secular in the light of the sacred, scriptural, and spiritual traditions of Western civilization.

If there is any meaning in the slogan "no Federal control," it means at least that the Federal government cannot really help education and cannot be just to all its citizens if it prefers the orthodoxy of secular humanism and makes the institutions devoted to its furtherance the sole recipients of governmental largesse.

It is important to recall that the teaching of religion even in public schools has *not* been forbidden by the Supreme Court. Mr. Justice Clark wrote for a majority of eight Justices in the Bible-reading cases in June 1963 as follows:

. . . one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. . . . Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the First Amendment.

In forthcoming discussions of Federal aid to church-related colleges, the greatest accuracy of thought must be safeguarded lest Catholics appear to be

conceding that all the arts and sciences from archeology to zoology can be taught "objectively" but that philosophy and theology do not fall into the category of those subjects which are treated "objectively."

Possibly, the most important policy which Catholics could discuss and develop is the necessity of American law recognizing the presence and the value of true cultural pluralism. The Supreme Court in recent years has tended to say that the state may recognize and help only those cultural activities which are exclusively secular in sponsorship and content. Such an approach establishes a certain cultural monism and does not reflect the cultural pluralism of the American people.

It is to this complex but crucial problem that Catholics should direct their attention. Catholics and all religionists will benefit both their religion and their nation if they continue to explore that religious and cultural diversity from which American society has drawn its inspiration and its genius and without which it cannot long continue as a truly free society.

Moral, Religious, and Spiritual Formation of Students—A National Need

RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN F. MURPHY

President, Villa Madonna College, Covington, Kentucky

THIS PANEL DISCUSSION presents specific reports of some success stories in efforts to form spiritually and motivate apostolically students in Catholic colleges. In a special sense, the program has unusual pertinence since it focuses entirely on the object of the educational efforts of all of us: the student himself.

It further emphasizes a particular aspect of Catholic education—that which necessarily undergirds the entire purpose of our existence in the service of the Church. If the end product of the Catholic college or university does not contribute in a significant fashion to the apostolic goals of the Church, we have lost our reason for existence.

Finally, with society in crisis and the Church shifting gears, we believe society and the Church—and American society and the American Church in particular—have a great need for what we claim to offer to both. Today, we would like to examine some of the practical efforts and programs on several of our campuses.

SISTER MARY JOHN, S.S.J.

Regis College, Weston, Massachusetts

I HAVE BEEN ASKED to contribute to the topic of today's panel on the moral, religious, and spiritual formation of students, with specific reference to the program which I direct at Regis College. What we do at Regis, and our purpose in doing it, is easy enough to run through, but to do justice to its place

in the national educational scheme makes me look around wildly for escape before I find myself in a cage with all the controversies which are raging around the Catholic schools at present.

First of all, it must be clearly understood that the Regis College lay apostolate is embedded in a collegiate setup. It is not a missionary work *per se* of the type of Grailville, PAVLA, Extension Volunteers (or even the Peace Corps) but a work proper to education on the college and university level. Its director is a professor on a full-time teaching schedule. I will fail badly in the point of my remarks today if I do not make quite clear that *its purpose*, quite simply, is to present a concrete case to college students for involving themselves in the work of the Church—and I mean the universal Church of good Pope John.

It hardly needs pointing out by me, however, that the workings of such a plan must be extremely simple; its projects must not be overambitious; and its expenses as near \$0.00 as possible. Such a set of requirements will inevitably present a picture of naiveté and lack of organization in the light of other groups whose aims and resources are different. But we have our ground rules firmly in mind, and I hope, our eye on the ball.

As many of you have heard me tell before, in 1949 some incidents and some forces converged on the Regis campus and resulted in a unique manifestation of student maturity and lay apostolic activity. The simple occurrence was the soberly stated plea from a sister in missionary work of education for assistance, for some one to take uncovered classes in her school on the island of Guam. It was answered by a graduating senior at Regis who taught as a lay teacher without pay during the years 1950-52. I do not consider this, of course the *reason*, but merely the opening for the activity that followed. It was the event which gave evidence of forces which had been gathering and had been searching for a way into existence.

I believe in the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. I believe God willed the laity to re-accept in a special way in this century their responsibilities as baptized Christians. I believe this lay apostolic force was a charismatic movement, well developed and sufficiently vocalized by the Church, to be on the threshold of full activity. Therefore, I believed, back in 1949, that all that was necessary was to find the door.

In order to understand our activity at Regis, it is necessary to realize that our program is directed to short-range activities—to situations where an educated and college-trained lay person can perform a task for a year or more under the supervision of, one may say, professional missionaries. For long-range, responsible jobs which take specific orientation, I recommend PAVLA, Peace Corps, Extension Volunteers, et cetera. For dedicated lives there are religious orders and lay institutes which provide organized and trained and professional personnel. As a rule, the Regis volunteers intend to give one year of their lives to assist those who are involved in missionary endeavors of one kind or another, especially teaching. They then return to their chosen "careers in the world." This secular career, however, must not be viewed as outside the pale of God's interest. Father Keller of Maryknoll has done great work in teaching that "whatever you do, do all in the name of the Lord."

I believe that, after four years of stiff intellectual training, exposure to Catholic thinking, and opportunities of making choices and decisions, college graduates should have the necessary equipment to operate as Catholic laywomen.

Granted the great intangible of *experience* is missing. It is for this very reason that the Regis volunteers are sent out as laywomen living a lay life and

as assistants who are to be briefed and guided by experienced and responsible missionaries. The Regis volunteers are a stopgap service and claim to be no more. They frankly admit that they get more than they give, and I can assert that none of my volunteers will join the ranks of the anticlericals. They have worked shoulder to shoulder with our hard-pressed missionaries; they have *given* to the cause and often suffered for it—and, as a result, I believe they are prepared, through *service*, for the “wider apostolate in the Church.”

Anyone who knows the objectives and the resources of colleges, especially Catholic colleges, knows that a full-blown missionary activity in them is impossible. I, as a coordinator of activities at Regis, can count only on the moral support and sympathy of my administration and my colleagues, which range from hostile, to disinterested, to interested, to warm in the classic bell-curve distribution. As far as money—which is the indispensable support of good activity as well as the root of all evil—it is in short supply, and when the college is aspiring to a science wing, money flowing out via the volunteer program causes some concern. I have no assistants and no colleagues in the work. Our operating budget comes each year anew from whatever the students can contribute. It rarely reaches \$2,000, and this must pay for transportation to the missions for as many as possible and support a flow of correspondence which is a delight to the Weston Post Office. After that, we must rely on the Providence of God.

One of the questions which I always meet is: How do you get them to go? I don't. It is now a student-inspired movement (I said it was charismatic!). I opened the door once and they saw the opportunities. They pass the word on to each other; the returning volunteers tell it; the volunteers in the field write and plea for successors. Frequently students come to Regis because they see the lay volunteer as an opportunity! The Mission Unit works for it. Out of the 170 Regis graduates who have served to date, I have only asked one girl directly and the circumstances were these: A young priest from El Paso, Texas, was standing at the College switchboard with a roll of blueprints under his arm. He had driven from Texas to plead with me to open his school in a new area which was slated to be finished in the following month. The same day I had overheard someone say that a past graduate working at Harvard had decided to try teaching and was at that moment taking Education courses at Boston teachers college. I called her up and asked her where she was going to put that teaching in practice. Unfortunately for her, she said she didn't know. But I said I did know: so she opened Blessed Sacrament School in El Paso. I had promised three girls to an Indian Reservation in the West, and being an “Indian giver” I asked for one of them back, to be allocated in Texas. Father went away very happy. Cardinal Cushing had sent him to me for courage, but of course he needed more so I had to petition it. But there is *no* recruiting program. I mean *none*. I have a bulletin board which asks for money or stamps and occasionally shares Peace Corps ads with Regis Lay Volunteers' letters.

There are further circumstances, which I believe feed the apostolic spirit. First, a strong instructional program which is integrated with philosophy and theology; second, an extracurricular program which encourages a campus climate of alert concern for the issues of the day in all areas and religious groups which are extremely vocal.

The “formation” which is so greatly worried about by many promoters of lay volunteers, perforce, is unique at Regis. I do it by counseling sessions myself, refer the volunteer to one who has served in her desired area in the past, advise her to correspond with the missionary she will soon serve. I do it by our

CCD unit which offers excellent training and a diploma. I believe that intelligent graduates prepared in their fields can operate as intelligent collaborators and edifying laity anywhere.

If I were to give you one word for success, I would say "freedom." The absence of moderator-directiveness, the opportunity to make up one's mind, the possibility of personal choice—these open doors, or better green pastures, provide the best soil for the seeds planted by the Holy Ghost.

Bible Devotions and National Needs

ANTONY MULLANEY, O.S.B.

St. Anselm's College, Manchester, New Hampshire

IT IS MOST APPROPRIATE that the role of the Word of God be acknowledged in this particular panel discussion. A primary reason for saying this can be found in the new Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. The latter calls for more abundant, more varied, and better-selected readings from the Bible. It also states that if we are to achieve the restoration of the liturgy it is essential to promote "a warm and living love for Scripture." And most appropriately for our topic, it calls for popular devotions which harmonize with the liturgical seasons, accord with the sacred liturgy, are in some fashion derived from it, and lead the people to it. Finally, it states that Bible devotions should be encouraged, the obvious reason being that they so admirably fulfill the above norms.

It is of great importance that we follow these directions since it is clear that to the college of bishops the primary means of renewal in the Church is the liturgy. Intrinsic to this statement is the fact that the Word is not only a teaching word, but a Word truly capable of building up the Body of Christ, making it more and more to be a visible sign of its being a love-community. Moreover, as a recent pastoral from the French bishops points out, our God is a God who speaks. But he has spoken and is speaking in historical events. Therefore, renewal demands that we go to the source whereby we encounter these saving events, namely, the Bible and the sacraments. Psychology gives much evidence of the transforming power of the word. Communication theory and the client-counselor relationship make this clear. How much more transforming is the Word of God.

Now to the topic. The title of the panel is misleading. It should not mean that we must prove that spiritual formation is a national need. Rather, our concern should be to demonstrate that the formation our students receive leads to involvement in the problems underlying our national needs. There is a big difference in attitude here. With this in mind, one way to show the relationship between formation and national needs is to outline a Bible devotion for you. Both its structure and content indicate how relevant to national needs such a service can be. God speaks, his people reply, the assembly prays. Let's look at each element briefly:

Hymns. Open and close the service. A real problem, but through the use of guitars and a selection of hymns easily adapted to the rhythm of folk music,

this part of the service can be made appealing to college students. The content of the hymns is a greater problem. Where do you find hymns relevant to national needs? One answer is the Lutheran Hymnal. This has a chapter entitled "Church Life and Work," and under this has many sections on such topics as Propagation of the Gospel, The City, The Nation, The World. Many excellent hymns can be found which show the role of the Church in the world.

Litany. This can easily be made relevant. The petition is announced and the people pray that God might hear us favorably. The petitions can be based on key sentences from the social encyclicals or from articles on such topics as racism, poverty, freedom, and so forth.

Lessons. Again relevancy to national needs is simple. The mind of Christ on a given topic is revealed. Then follows a response (e.g., a Gelineau psalm verse or two), silent prayer, and then the oration by the celebrant. Revelation and response: the chance to say "Yes."

Following the lessons, there is a homily and then some action on the part of the assembly. A blessing with and enthronement of the Gospel book is appropriate; kissing the book is possible if the assembly is small. A final hymn brings the service to a close.

And so the well-constructed Bible devotion lends itself easily to proclaiming the relevance of Christianity to the needs of our times. But the relationship is clear from other angles, too. For example, Bible devotions are clearly based on the fore-Mass. This can be instructive for us (especially if the devotions are raised to the rank of liturgy without at the same time becoming rigidly stabilized in form) since it is primarily in the liturgical assembly that the gospel is proclaimed and the apostolic preaching is continued. The perfect visible sign of "Church" is to be found in the liturgy. The perfect witness can be made in the liturgical assembly. Therefore, it is here that we are most formed as witnesses and here that we most act as witnesses. And it is also here that we realize that witness extends beyond the assembly. Now, the layman has a vocation to love and to take seriously the temporal order. He has a vocation to "secularity." Therefore, a knowledge of national needs, a deep concern for national needs, and an impelling drive to attack the problems connoted by these needs is the very stuff of which his sanctity is made. And so a devotion which is similar to the liturgy of the Word can have a great effect.

Another example is the fact that the structure of the devotion reveals to an individual that *response* to revelation is at the heart of Christianity. God speaks, we respond; Christianity is dialogue. The very notion of a "vigil" brings this out, too. In the early church if Christ did not appear in glory during the Vigil, the people left the assembly realizing that more witnessing was needed before the Body could be built up to that point where we reach the "mature measure of the fulness of Christ."

There are many other values to the Bible devotion. Since it is a mirror of the fore-Mass, the importance and relevance of the latter can be made more manifest to students. The tie-in can also be shown by using the same hymns in both services. Secondly, it is not necessary that the celebrant be a priest. Thirdly, it is very appropriate for the ecumenical dialogue. It is also easily adapted and constructed so that it can be very simple or complex and can be held for any occasion; it is a good source for experimentation; it provides a real experience of community due to the relaxed and informal setting, and encourages a love for a biblical-liturgical orientation in formation. Last, but not least, evidence indicates that college students like the Bible devotions.

Understanding the Interracial Question: An Element in Sister Formation

REV. WILLIAM J. KENEALY, S.J.

Professor of Law, Boston College

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness . . .

THESE FAMILIAR WORDS are not part of the organic law of the land. Nevertheless, the Declaration of Independence, which appealed in express terms to God, to the Creator, to the Supreme Judge of the World, and which expressly committed our young nation to His Divine Providence, was a deliberate and solemn affirmation of the politico-religious faith of the American people. The words I have quoted sounded the trumpet for the American Revolution of 1776. They proclaimed to a skeptical and cynical world the vital spirit which engendered the Constitution of 1789 and inspired the Bill of Rights in 1791. They still epitomize the politico-religious philosophy of our democratic society.

But a philosophy is not enough. It must be put to work. Ideals are not self-executing. General principles alone do not solve particular problems. Herein lies a tremendous historical and constitutional lesson which is pertinent to the greatest domestic problem facing the nation this day. And a tremendous religious and moral lesson which is pertinent to the greatest educational problem facing the American Church, the clergy, the religious, and the laity of our day.

Thirteen years after the Declaration of Independence, our Federal Constitution was ratified. In most respects it was a magnificent and dynamic document. But it was not perfect. It was not written in heaven. Despite the solemn and inspiring declaration of the equality of all men under God, some of the Founding Fathers were slave owners. In the Constitution of 1789 they provided for human slavery, protected the slave trade, and required the rendition of fugitive slaves to their so-called owners. The Declaration of 1776 remained a politico-religious dedication to things hoped for, but not yet seen. Not seen in 1789. Nor in 1864. Nor in 1964. How could that be? The Founding Fathers were not gross hypocrites. The people of the time were not moral monsters.

Profoundly influenced by the customs and traditions of their own time (as, indeed, all of us are), partially blinded by the persuasiveness of property (a perennial myopia), and bitterly compromised by the jealousies of sectional politics (a problem still with us), our Founding Fathers failed to appreciate to the full, or at least to implement in the Constitution, the

majestic politico-religious faith they had proudly promulgated in the Declaration of Independence. They consented to the demands of slave owners and slave traders, they yielded to the claims of inhuman property rights, they capitulated to the desires of arbitrary states' rights. As a result the tragedy and abomination of human slavery continued for seventy more bitter years, until the nation was plunged into the catastrophe of the bloodiest Civil War in all history.

I have a profound reverence for the Founding Fathers. I am sincerely inspired by their great positive achievements. But I do not deify them. They were great men, but not divine. They were wise men, but not infallible. And I confess to considerable impatience with patriotic speeches, in or out of political conventions, urging an uncritical *return* to the Founding Fathers. Is it not given to nations, as to men, to grow? Not merely in age and in size, but in wisdom and in grace as well? Wherefore, in the realization and perfection of the politico-religious ideals of American democracy, it seems to me imperative that we proceed, not *back* to the Founding Fathers, but *forward* from their mighty positive achievements.

We have done so, thank God, to a considerable extent. We have not been entirely shackled by a blind and unreasoning adherence to all the racial injustices of the past. The Civil War destroyed forever the savagery of human slavery. The Civil War Amendments moved the nation forward in giant strides from the *status quo* of the Founding Fathers and in the direction at least of human liberty, personal dignity, and the equality of all men under God. We did advance in wisdom, we did grow in grace. The ideals of the Declaration of Independence, the principles of the natural law, the teachings of Christianity, found more realistic implementation in the nation's Constitution—as they found more realistic acceptance in the nation's conscience.

It was the belief of many, and the hope of others, that the Civil War Amendments had finally abolished, not merely human slavery, but also all forms of racial degradation and discrimination. But these beliefs and hopes were doomed to frustration by a tragic decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1896 when, in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the Court decided that the "equal protection of the laws" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment was satisfied by a Louisiana statute which required railroads in that state to provide "equal but separate" facilities for the white and colored races; and, therefore, that compulsory racial segregation was constitutional. Contrary to a popular notion, there were very few segregation statutes, anywhere in the United States, before *Plessy v. Ferguson* gave the constitutional green light to racial discrimination. But the sanctioning of compulsory segregation on the railroads of Louisiana in 1896 was promptly seized upon as a legal benediction for racism generally. The decision unleashed a horde of segregation statutes in a dozen states affecting, not merely transportation, but almost every conceivable public necessity and social convenience in organized society. It created the greatest domestic evil of the twentieth century.

At the turn of the century the nation retreated again from its politico-religious ideals. The stupid flag of white supremacy was raised again in the land. The infamous badge of racial degradation was fastened again upon millions of Americans. Negro men, women, children, were humiliated and herded into lives of bitter frustration and second-class citizenship. White men, women, children, were gravely harmed, too, in consciences perverted by un-Christian arrogance and cruelty, by the moral deterioration which inevitably infects the strong who oppress the weak. The evil was by

no means confined to the South. By reason of the strange tendency of many Americans to equate legality with morality, the virus of racism metastasized throughout the body politic, North and South. Our nation became sick. It is still sick.

In 1954 the Supreme Court of the United States reversed *Plessy v. Ferguson* and repudiated all constitutional and legal justification for racism. In doing so the Court demonstrated its humility, its courage, and its constant if faltering pursuit of the American ideal. We moved forward again, legally. We advanced in wisdom, legally. We grew in grace, legally. But racism, with the momentum of sixty-eight years, marches on. We see it all around us in the North and the South. We hear it in the storm of abuse and vilification heaped upon the Court since 1954. Racism, whether by compulsion of unconstitutional statutes in the South, or by force of un-Christian snobbery in the North, is essentially the same vicious moral evil. As a fundamental moral evil, it cannot be solved adequately by the Supreme Court or the law. It must be solved in the hearts of men.

Having lived in both North and South, I must confess in all candor that I think there is far more hypocrisy about race relations in the North than in the South. With the exception of certain prominent and bilingual politicians, most Southerners say what they mean and practice what they preach. What they say and what they practice is frequently saddening and sometimes terrifying. But at least there is usually a conformity between preachment and practice. But what of Northerners?

A year ago the historic National Conference on Religion and Race stated that, "Racism is crushing the hopes, stifling the lives, shackling the liberties, and shrouding the happiness of millions of our fellow citizens in both North and South." Despite the high teachings of all religious faiths, entrenched patterns of racial discrimination pervade the civil, the political, professional, the business, the social, the private, and the religious life of our country. Americans of all religious faiths have been blind to the grossness of the evil. Americans of all religious faiths have participated in the evil. In many instances, in our houses of worship, in our religious schools, in our religious hospitals, in our charitable institutions, in our fraternal organizations, in our private and religious lives, we have obviously and notoriously failed to practice what we preach. We have failed the law of God.

Since racism is basically a moral problem, one of the most disturbing factors about it, in my opinion, is that the great cardinal virtue of prudence is being misused as an excuse for not practicing the great moral virtues of justice and charity. Prudence is fast becoming a dirty word for cowardice.

In the name of prudence we are told to play down the racial issue, because racial tensions have increased since the Supreme Court spoke out. It is true that racial tensions have increased since 1954. The segregation cases inspired the hopes of Negroes and aroused the anger of racists. There would be no racial tensions if Negroes would be content with the disabilities of second-class citizenship, and racists could be secure in the privileges of white supremacy. But the day of Uncle Tom is gone. Racial tensions are the sign and the price of progress in interracial justice. They are the growing pains of eventual interracial peace.

In the name of prudence we are cautioned to be tender with deep and traditional emotions. It is true that such emotions are an important part of the total practical problem. But it is difficult at times to know *whose* emotions we are to be tender with, and in what proportion. The unreason-

able emotions of racists, or the reasonable emotions of their victims? All human beings have emotions.

In the name of prudence we are urged to pursue the course of gradualism. It is true that a certain amount of gradualism unfortunately seems to be necessary, or in any event inevitable. But Negroes, as other men, grow old. For many of them the evening of life approaches. How long must they wait? How long must their children wait? Or their grandchildren? All the weak human inclinations of selfishness, laziness, timidity, complacency, and conformism tend to strengthen the thesis of gradualism and to support the plea of pseudo-prudence. But the real virtue of prudence has nothing whatsoever to do with these moral weaknesses.

Prudence is the great intellectual virtue which enables men to appreciate the moral issues in practical problems, and select the most efficient morally good means to morally good solutions—whether such means are easy or difficult, popular or unpopular, joyful or sorrowful, attractive or repulsive, pleasing or frightening. Prudence is opposed to rashness, not to courage. Prudence exacted heroic courage from the early Christian martyrs. In the area of modern race relations, prudence demands that we sincerely select the most efficient morally good means to eradicate “with all deliberate speed” the harsh hatreds and the gross injustices of racism. What is needed most today, it seems to me, is not more insistence upon prudence, but a more vigorous call to courage. The contemporary need is to find, somewhere or somehow, the moral courage to practice what we preach.

Sometimes, when I feel secretly ashamed of my own cowardice and complacency, and the abstractions of philosophical and legal considerations seem insufficient to move me out of my lethargy, I turn, as I suppose all of us do, to personal experience. I think back to a time, some twenty years ago, when the armies of dictator nations were shattering the civilization of Europe. America was not yet formally involved in the great war. But the impact of the spreading conflict had transformed the United States into forty-eight vast debating societies. The public atmosphere was vibrant with principle and policy, argument and rebuttal, invective and recrimination, fear and hysteria. In public assemblies and private meetings, in the headlines and over the air waves, statesmen of renown and unknown men in the streets furiously debated the paramount issue of the day: Should we enter the war or stay out? But the question was finally and suddenly settled by others.

On December 7, 1941, the bloodstained fist of totalitarianism reached across the Pacific and plunged a dagger in the nation's back. The roar of a plane, the crash of a bomb, and the cries of mangled and dying Americans echoed over the waters, into the hills, down the valleys, across the plains, and beat against the doors of every home in the land, West and East and North and South. The shock of Pearl Harbor paralyzed us for a fearful moment that fateful Sunday afternoon. But the next instant it galvanized us into swift and unified action. Our disputes were over. Our debates were ended. Our arguments were done.

From all over the land, from home and school, from farm and factory, from office and shop, from hopes and ambitions, and from the arms of their loved ones, millions of American boys—Protestant and Jew and Catholic, white and black and red and yellow and brown—rushed in dedication to camp, to ship, to plane, to foxhole. A united voice from pulpit and platform, from press and radio and newsreel, begged them to wage courageous

battle against the scourge of *racism* which had the civilized world on its knees; exhorted them to fight, to suffer, to die if necessary—not in the name of racial hatred or segregation or discrimination or snobbery—but in so many express words (remember them?) for the American philosophy of life, for the inalienable rights of men, for the dignity of human personality, for the rights of minorities, for the four freedoms everywhere; that, by their sacrifice, the lights of human freedom and equality might go on again, all over the world.

And so exhorted, they fought, they suffered, and multiple thousands of them laid down their young lives on the seven seas and in every land from Berlin to Tokyo. I remember that they were white and black and red and yellow and brown. I can never forget them, because it was my high privilege to know very many of them personally, to live with them, to share with them, to laugh with them, to fear with them, to grieve with them, to confess them, to anoint them, to love them dearly. I can never forget them, because in the deafening thunder, in the acrid smoke, in the lurid flame of battle, I can still see them going down. And in the pitch darkness of the long nights after, in the Marianas, in the New Hebrides, in the Philippines, I buried them—white and black and red and yellow and brown. But I buried every one of them in a first-class grave. I buried them all in the *unsegregated* sea.

These, our own, perchance your brothers, your relatives, your friends, your former students, are dead. I cannot wipe away the sorrow of their dying. But neither can I ever lose the inner peace and the fierce pride which stems from my conviction that they died, under the Living God, at least for ideals that are worthy. They fought a good fight. They won a just war. They saved their beloved country. And they earned by their young deaths the undying gratitude of their countrymen.

Yet, twenty years later, we surviving Americans are still arguing, still debating, still making our pretty little speeches and writing our fine learned briefs to decide whether or not, after all, we really intend to practice the ideals we begged them to die for. Twenty years later, may God forgive us, we are still segregating the living and the dead. Twenty years later the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation has passed, and the Congress of the United States has yet to enact a civil rights bill of substance and of courage. Twenty years later racist politicians, running on racist platforms, are elected to major public offices. State legislators are dragging their reluctant heels over bills for fair housing, fair employment, fair educational practices. Federal troops are needed to escort nine Negro children to their public school. Federal forces are required to admit one qualified Negro veteran to his state university. Federal marshals are necessary to protect Negro students on their way to class. Police turn powerful fire hoses and unleash snarling dogs upon Americans crying for freedom and equality. Private citizens throw bombs, burn buses, swing clubs, shout obscenities, smear mustard, pour catsup, and grind cigarette butts into the nonviolent backs of fellow citizens who want a sandwich at a lunch counter. Four Negro Sunday School girls are brutally murdered in their church, because their church had been utilized as the headquarters in a peaceful campaign for Christian and American ideals. What is the matter with us? Why is our nation so sick? Why is our memory so short? Our gratitude so thin? Our resolution so weak? Surely, this is not our proudest day.

Yet, it is a day of opportunity. A day of awakening. A day which has finally aroused the conscience of the nation. A day in which the

enormity of the evil has produced a revolution which, please God, will eventually transform the face and uplift the heart of America. That revolution has begun. It began, I think, with the inspiring and prayerful National March for Freedom in Washington last August. It is a radical revolution which demands an end to the cruelty and hypocrisy of racism in the North and in the South. It is an American revolution which demands that American ideals be sincerely and effectively realized in American life. It is a Christian revolution which demands that Christian principles be sincerely and effectively practiced by those who profess the Faith of Christ. I pray God that this American and Christian revolution will be peaceful, speedy, successful, in our time, here, now.

The failure of the Founding Fathers to implement the inspiring philosophy of the Declaration of Independence has been matched by the failure of Catholics to implement the teachings of our Divine Faith. We Catholics, like other religious groups, have our closets stuffed with skeletons. In fact, some of ours seem to insist upon sitting upright in the front pew, and a few pop up grotesquely in the pulpit. But, thank God, they *are* skeletons. They do not exemplify the justice and the love which animates the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.

Theologically, the enormous evil of racism is one aspect of the continuing crucifixion of Christ. For we preach Christ Crucified. And Christ is still being crucified in His Mystical Body. But the terrifying thing is that the scourge is wielded, the thorns are pressed, the nails are hammered, the cross is lifted, and the lance is thrust, by Christian hands, by Catholic hands, by clerical hands, by religious hands—the while we make pretensions to moral leadership and proclaim our love of the Crucified Christ.

The ideals of the Declaration of Independence, the principles of the natural law, the philosophy of human freedom and equality under God, have always been embraced by the theology of the Church Universal. The essential unity of the human race, the essential equality of all men, the essential dignity of human personality, have been sanctified by the Sacrifice of Calvary, illumined by the dawn of Easter, emblazoned by the fires of Pentecost, and heralded to the corners of the earth by the gospel of Catholicism: teaching our common origin in the First Adam, our common redemption by the Second Adam, our common sanctification in the Mystical Body of Christ, and our common destiny in the beatific vision of the Most Blessed Trinity.

The unanimous judgment of the teaching Church, popes and bishops, dogmatic and moral theologians, seminary and university professors, is that racism, with its segregations and discriminations, in religious or secular, in public or private life, is morally wrong. It is a cancer in the body politic. It is a desecration of Christian civilization. It is a blasphemy in the Mystical Body of Christ. It is—with all reverence and accuracy—a God-damned thing.

We Catholics like to think that Almighty God is on the side of our way of life. It is true, however, only to the extent that our way of life is on the side of Him who said: "*I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.*" But in His eyes there is neither white nor black nor red nor yellow nor brown, neither Jew nor Gentile nor Barbarian nor Scythian, but all are brothers in Christ Jesus. And He Himself, the night before He died for all men without exception, bequeathed to each of us this glorious but awesome test: "*By this will all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for another.*"

The early Christians took this test seriously, enthusiastically, courageously. Wherefore the pagans of Rome, in their classical writings, exclaimed in astonishment and admiration: "*See how these Christians love one another!*" But whether in ancient Rome or in modern America, South or North, no man does, no man can, segregate or discriminate, in secular or religious, in public or private life, against those he truly loves. Much less, a consecrated Bride of Jesus Christ.

Understanding the Interracial Question: An Element in Sister Formation

MATTHEW AHMANN

*Executive Director, National Catholic Conference for
Interracial Justice, Chicago*

LET US LOOK very briefly at some of the changes in race relations in the last few years; then, some of the changes in religious action, religious witness, for racial justice in the last few years; some of the things which ought to be able to be done by communities like yours. And, finally, some of the ways in which the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice might be a little bit helpful to your communities.

We have observed a long-time effort by the traditional Negro civil rights organizations—the NAACP, the Urban Leagues, and others—to follow the course that Father Kenealy sketched in for us, expanding the freedom which would be permitted by a solid basis of constitutional law in this country. That pattern of Negro action has come to a showdown even though NAACP and others continue legal action. The last few years we have been witness to a tremendous change in the way the Negro community tries to secure its own rights in this country. Beginning with the sit-ins in 1960 and 1961, we witnessed more rapid racial change resulting from direct action in Southern communities, with less violence and bitter reaction by white people than we had witnessed from 1954 to 1960 when the desegregation of public school systems in the South followed the historic May 1954 Supreme Court decision. It has been the snail's pace of implementation of constitutional reform which has driven Negroes to the streets. From 1954 to today, only about 8 percent of the Negro students in the South have found their way from a segregated school system to the desegregated school system.

We know the history of direct action, but what we don't always know is what a tremendous upheaval this has been inside the Negro community. What we don't know is the growing solidarity of the Negro community indicating that the pace at which racial justice is being sought by that community today is the right or perhaps even too slow a pace. Lou Harris' *Newsweek* polls indicate that 74 percent of U.S. whites think Negroes are moving too fast; only 3 percent of Negroes think they are moving too fast. Stable Negro leadership is being pressured from within and sometimes being dumped by new up-and-coming leadership. The NAACP and other organiza-

tions are being forced to realign parts of their programs because of changes within the Negro community. The NAACP, which only two years ago and perhaps even somewhere in the South today is called a Communist front or a Communist organization, is now cast as a relatively conservative Negro action organization compared to CORE and SNCC.

All of this tremendous upheaval we have seen in the South, which in the last year has found its way to the northern city, culminated in the impact of the crisis of Birmingham last year. That was a crisis which, like nothing in the history of this country, consolidated Negro opinion on the methods the Negro community must use to achieve its civil rights, on the pace at which it must proceed, on its willingness to sacrifice its jobs and its lives for freedom. And, like no other event in the history of this country, Birmingham had an impact on the white conscience. Growing out of Birmingham and other events of the year, I think that many thousands and millions of white people in this country were ready to move to desegregation if the churches or any other predominantly white institutions were ready to give them more direction. I don't think the churches were entirely ready for the challenge.

What does this tremendous upheaval and the conflict between Negro and white values mean? It means, for example, that if the civil rights bill currently before the United States Senate is not passed substantially as it came from the House, the country will be in very serious trouble. The March on Washington last year—a marvelous and prayerful demonstration given by Negro and white Christians and Jews—could very easily have been a march on the halls of Congress and an attempt to disrupt the orderly procedures of our democracy. We could very well see around our country this year major bloodsheds in the streets of our cities. We may see that even yet, if the civil rights bill is passed without major modification, and that at least should be some demonstration to us of how serious the racial crisis is.

In addition to change within the Negro community there's been movement in the churches, too, to face the racial crisis and to seek some progress to racial justice in our country. For years, men worked within religious groups to try to stimulate denominations to develop aggressive programs in race relations and to overcome the sins of segregation within the religious community itself. In our church there was Father John LaFarge and a good handful of pioneer bishops. But growing, I think, not out of the National Conference on Religion and Race—though that gave us some direction—but growing out of Birmingham we have seen a fresh initiative on the part of the churches and synagogues in race relations. Not long after Birmingham, the board of the National Council of Churches met in New York City in a meeting described by some of the members of that board as a "religious experience" and not a board meeting. In violation of the structure of the National Council of Churches, the board established an Emergency Commission on Religion and Race. With a budget of \$300,000 for the second half of last year, and staff borrowed from a number of major Protestant denominations, the NCC gave that commission a mandate to shake up the Protestant community in race relations. Today, staff people from the National Council of Churches are active in every major racial crisis situation in this country.

About a month after this historic meeting of the board of the National Council of Churches, the United Presbyterian Church met in Des Moines, Iowa. There it, too, formed its own emergency Commission on Religion and Race with a budget of \$300,000 for the last five months of 1963. And

its staff, too, is providing new leadership for the Protestant community in race relations. Similar efforts have developed and are maturing in a variety of other Protestant denominations: the Disciples of Christ, the United Church of Christ, the American Baptist Convention, even the Seventh Baptist Convention.

Similar efforts have developed in the Jewish community. Teams of rabbis have been organized by the Conservative and the Reform rabbinic organizations and are available on call by Negro leadership in the South. The Negro leadership in Hattiesburg or Oxford, Mississippi, or Selma, Alabama, needs help, and needs the protection resulting from the intervention of people from outside which draws the attention of public media. They can call on the Conservative or Reform rabbinic groups for help and they will get that help immediately. The secular Jewish civil rights organizations, particularly the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee, last year for the first time hired staff to specialize in race relations in a similar manner to the way staff is employed by Negro civil rights organizations. Though these Jewish civil rights groups have a long history of work for interracial justice, for the first time they specialized and concentrated in the same way that Negro civil rights organizations did.

There was a new and fresh movement in the Catholic community, too. The Conference on Religion and Race had a greater impact on the Catholic community than on many other religious communities in this country. The movement in the Catholic community witnessed some fifty to sixty pastorals by Roman Catholic bishops across the country, many of them announcing new concrete programs in race relations; fifteen bishops are beginning to insert anti-discrimination policies in their building and purchasing contracts. It has witnessed a whole host of concrete actions like these. It witnessed the presence of nuns giving witness for Christ in Chicago. It witnessed the presence of nuns giving witness for Christ in the NAACP March in San Francisco. It witnessed the nuns on the front page of the *New York Times* the day before the March on Washington, giving witness for Christ in the basement of Riverside Church in New York City, making sandwiches for the March. We have witnessed and been participants in a tremendous new surge of energy in the commitment of the Catholic community to racial justice in the last twelve months. In many areas in the Catholic community today, clerical leaders are far ahead of the lay community. The lay community is now acting as a suppressant on the Church's role in race relations. Nonetheless we have a long way to go in the Roman Catholic community. Negro opinion in the Church has been below the surface—not freely expressed—for years. Only now, are we beginning to hear a little bit of it. We need this Negro opinion to purify our own life. That Negro opinion must be open and free. We must give it vehicles and ways to express itself. For without the internal witness of that opinion a Roman Catholic religious community will not fulfill its vocation.

We have a tremendous practical responsibility in race relations in this country. Even in the South, in areas where Catholics number only one or two percent of the total population, perhaps less, we have a tremendous responsibility and can move with vigor (and some of the bishops have demonstrated this possibility) because we have social prestige. I don't think that we should be proud of our social prestige, but if we have it we should use it to advantage and to the advantage of Christ. We can desegregate our institutions in a more easy fashion than public institutions can be desegregated. We need not hesitate to desegregate our hospitals, our parochial

school systems; to abolish the double-parish system which saved the Church from the same split that took place at the time of the Civil War in a number of major Protestant denominations, and somehow contained within the Roman Catholic community and permitted and tolerated the practice of heresy.

We have a tremendous responsibility in the North as well. Race relations in the North are more severe in the exacerbation on people in society than race relations in the South. It will take a lot longer to eliminate the ghettos of the North than to eliminate racial segregation in the South. The racial ghettos of the North will be with us for a hundred or two hundred years and they never will disappear without vigorous action by the Roman Catholic community. For it is in the North that the Catholic community is strong. It is in the North where the Catholic community is vigorous and wealthy. It is in the North where the bulk of the Catholic leadership of this country is. In many cities in the North today, Catholics are in the majority on public school boards. Most of these Catholics trained in our parochial school system. In many places these Catholics on public school boards are refusing to let the public school system address the racial problem within it with candor. In city after city where the public school crisis is growing, large blocks of Catholics from heavily Catholic neighborhoods are circling City Hall, or demonstrating as they did in Cleveland, and are preventing the city fathers from addressing racial problems with candor. Too frequently, it is Catholic neighborhoods where the opposition to racial justice in northern cities is coming from. It is the Church of Christ which will bear the responsibility for the remaining sins of segregation in the North.

While we have made tremendous progress, we need the civil rights bill. We need much more, too. Because even with this new direction we have a long way to go.

It is important, too, to listen to the prophetic voices which cry in the wilderness about the role of the "white" churches in the United States. There's a book coming out in May written by a young Episcopalian attorney and theologian, Bill Stringfellow, a layman. He's been delegate to some of the important meetings of the World Council of Churches as well as the National Council of Churches. He writes in this book:

The churches of white society in America have largely forfeited any claim to leadership in the relations between the races. And to a great extent have not even seriously understood those relations in terms of the Christian faith. Their active concern in the last century has been to an overwhelming degree limited to the nominal pronouncements of church assemblies and ecclesiastical authorities. But few of these pronouncements have betrayed a theological understanding of the relations of the races. Mainly they have repeated the empty dogmas of humanism and the platitudes of tolerance. And often the whole subject has been simply ignored altogether. The lack of commitment in the churches was evident as recently as January, 1963, during the National Conference on Religion and Race in Chicago. The conference was so out of touch with the realities of the racial revolt in America that in the main it failed to recognize or address them. But what I noticed at the conference was that even as it met, the pickets and the demonstrators were ready to march in the streets. What went ignored in the conference were such issues of religion and race as the Black Muslims and Negro anti-Semitism. The conference was spared hearing such harsh realities of the racial crisis as these. Another indication of the massive indifference to and ignorance of the intensity, pathology, and alienation represented by the racial crisis is the manner in which Negroes were treated by the Conference leadership itself.

Apart from a single exception of Martin Luther King no Negro spokesman was on the program of the conference except for those who introduced other speakers, entertained the delegates, or prayed over the deliberations. Uncle Tom was the most popular Negro at the National Conference on Religion and Race. His days are gone forever, engulfed in the tide of the racial revolution the nation now suffers. But it is important to remember that one of Uncle Tom's last days was spent at this conference of the churches of the land, saying "Yes suh" to the most banal clichés within the vocabulary of white religionists praising the progress that has been achieved in race relations in America within the very shadow of Chicago's teeming black ghettos and reciting in unison the sentimental psalms of interfaith meetings about the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

I raise, [Bill Stringfellow said] no particular question about the nice intentions, good will or benign disposition of anybody at the conference. But I do say that the churches ought to be realistic and face and state the truth about the American racial crisis. They must speak out and act out of the depths of faith and not merely as those who follow the status quo whatever it happens to be . . . risking their reputations and possessions if they speak prophetically in faith.

What Bill Stringfellow is saying is that we are very near to the point when the young part of the Negro community of America is totally alienated from Christianity and totally alienated from any respect for the Constitution and the law of the land.

This is the challenge before us—for the laity, for the Catholic clergy, for our bishops, for those of you who have responsibilities for training sisters who will teach, who will do social work, and who will work in the hospitals. What is needed from the nun is a witness which is meaningful to this problem today: a witness in teaching, a witness in hospital work, a witness in the administration of hospitals, a witness in social work, a witness in the specific race relations apostolate represented by Catholic civil rights organizations and by secular and civil rights organizations, a witness in extensive efforts to recruit Negro girls for the sisterhood. We need programs for Negro youth; we need programs for Negro families; we need programs for Negro missions; we need programs for the white community; we need programs in our parochial school systems and in our colleges. We need programs in our parochial school systems which will make a deliberate and positive effort to teach in meaningful fashion the principles of interracial justice. We need programs which will make it possible for our white children in our white schools to meet and to get to know Negro children. We need programs to bring about more extensive integration and racial balance in the parochial school systems of this country. We need programs of deliberate hospital integration. We need programs of active civic witness in neighborhoods. We need nuns on the boards and the committees of civil rights organizations. All of these things will make up a meaningful witness.

We have to organize this; and there are ways in which it can be organized. Is there any real reason why all the sisterhoods of this country cannot very quickly put into practice planned preservice academic training programs for all those who will be going forth eventually into our school systems and our hospitals and our social agencies? It seems to me possible, drawing on the resources of a variety of orders, to organize teams of nuns with skills in intergroup relations who might travel from motherhouse to motherhouse, to put on concentrated academic courses in intergroup relations, and while such a team is present in a community it could forage around in the

nearby area and develop some experience projects or field work opportunities for those nuns who are presently in training.

Isn't it possible to give more specific training to those nuns who are already in service? Isn't it possible to very quickly draw on the experience of those Catholic hospitals which have desegregated, and train the administrators of our hospitals in well-structured seminars, and within the next year or year and a half desegregate all of the Catholic hospitals in this country completely and totally? Isn't it possible to develop programs of in-service training of our teachers to get our teachers active in examination of curriculum materials; to get our teachers active in developing new instruments and new devices for the training of Negro and white pupils? Isn't it possible for us to get our sisters in parochial and high school teaching out into the neighborhoods so that they can understand some of the problems of the Negro and white families whose children they have in their schools, so they can understand some of the tensions with which the white kids are faced—the white kids having good values, perhaps receiving good values in school coming in opposition with their parents at home who have very bad values? Isn't it possible for our nuns in social service work to get more deeply involved in the neighborhood life of our cities, to develop programs to meet the real needs of the poor of today?

I took a quick look over the program of the convention going on here in Atlantic City and the only social service kinds of workshops or meetings that I could observe were two—one of which is an effort to share information on teaching the blind. I saw nowhere in the NCEA program the least suggestion that anyone here is concerned with the problem of the poor of today, with the problem of teaching the poor of today, with the problem of developing the many other programs which are needed to reconcile the poor of today with the rich of today. And, very candidly, race relations in the United States will never be good until our economy is much expanded, until there are jobs enough to go around, until there are jobs for Negroes and other members of other minority groups in this country. But where in the meetings of our Catholic organizations do we find sensitivity to these kinds of problems?

Surely we can provide in-service training for sisters, and lay teachers, too, to give an insight into some of these problems.

In the South it seems to me we need the development, in the Negro parochial school system which still exists, of special pilot educational projects. We need special resources poured for a year or two into selective parochial schools in rural areas to see if we can develop educational techniques, the involvement of parents in the educational process and many other things, which then can be transferred to the rest of the parochial school systems in the rural South. There are those orders which have something of a commitment to rural work, some working presently in the North which could very easily get involved in rural work in the Negro community of the Delta counties of Alabama and Mississippi. And then, of course, we could get involved in such things as will occur in Mississippi this summer. From 1,000 to 2,000 young students from the North, the East, and the West will be going to Mississippi this summer. They are going to do very simple things, things that many of our nuns know how to do. They're going to teach literacy. To teach literacy in some of the counties of Mississippi is a risk. Now I may be pessimistic, but I don't see much possibility of our nuns being involved in this literacy training project this summer. I wish to God they would. But it certainly is within the scope of the work of many

of our nuns to do precisely this kind of work and to give precisely this kind of witness for Christ. Surely, our Catholic community is creative and ingenious and strong enough to develop the kinds of programs which will be meaningful to the people in the Delta counties of the South and to sustain and support this kind of work.

This is just a very brief sketch of some of the things which might be done. You know much more than I what could be done. But we must get new and extensive work under way within the next year or year and a half or two. For after that—if we have the resources and do not begin—it surely will be too late, and after that the Church surely will have forfeited any claims to the allegiance of the Negro community. It is urgent that you agree to make a commitment to train, to devote energy and manpower and resources to these kinds of projects. It is urgent that the Catholic community commit its power to the civil rights struggle.

Relating the Problem of Poverty in the Modern World to Spiritual Formation

SISTER MARY DANIEL, S.N.D. de N.

Provincial Superior, Ilchester, Maryland

MICHAEL HARRINGTON wryly observes, "I guess poverty has become fashionable." To align oneself with the "war on poverty" is currently politically smart, socially avant-garde, and ecumenically stimulating. For none of these reasons, however, have we chosen poverty as the theme of this panel. Rather, recognizing the truth of Danielou's dictum, "He who takes God seriously may be sure he will be a poor man," we question how to reconcile this truth with the biblical imperative, "There ought to be no poor in your midst" (Deut. 15:4). This apparent paradox must be resolved, or, more exactly, these two truths must be integrated, if we are to prepare our sisters to live their vow of poverty meaningfully in a world which has declared "war on poverty."

In striving to reconcile and integrate them, we must steer our way firmly between the Scylla of an angelism which takes no account of the real needs of men and a Charybdis which reduces Christian charity and justice to mere natural philanthropy. We shall find our course charted for us if we introduce our sisters to a study in depth of the biblical concept of poverty. A biblical appreciation of poverty ensures a proper understanding of the true nature of poverty and thus the gradual alleviation of its physical aspects.

When we trace the theme of poverty in the Bible under so reliable a guide as Albert Gelin—parenthetically, I might add I am simply paraphrasing Gelin—it becomes apparent that it is not contradictory to exact poverty of him who takes God seriously and yet demand that no poor be in our midst.

A long line of poor files through the pages of the Bible, and they are presented as the object of God's constant and loving care. He takes the poor seriously. He consoles them through the voice of the psalmist, of Nehemias

in 2 Esdras, of many other inspired ones. Through Ben Sirach He commands that the poor be cared for:

My son, rob not the poor man of his livelihood; force not the eyes of the needy to turn away. A hungry man grieve not; a needy man anger not; do not exasperate the downtrodden; delay not to give to the needy. A beggar in distress do not reject; avert not your face from the poor. From the needy turn not your eyes; give no man reason to curse you . . . Give hearing to the poor man and return his courtesy; deliver the oppressed from the hand of the oppressor; let not justice be repugnant to you (4: 1-10).

Through His inspired word, then God commands an active concern for the immediate needs of the poor, both on the part of individuals and of society. In Deuteronomy, poverty is an evil to be vigorously opposed. In Leviticus, explicit legislation for the relief of the poor is enacted:

the Jubilee ordinance to eliminate permanent poverty (25)
the condemnation of usury (25:36)
the prompt payment of workers (19:14)
the right of the poor to glean after the harvesters (19:10).

These regulations were made in the light of Deuteronomy 15:11:

the needy will never be lacking in the land; that is why I command you to open your hand to the poor and needy kinsmen in your country.

Here we are inescapably reminded of Christ's own words, "The poor you have always with you." Social justice is not ordered to the complete abolition of material poverty in the world, although it demands constant efforts to alleviate poverty.

To sisters in formation, it may appear that their first vow contributes little to such efforts. By studying the evolution of the biblical vocabulary of poverty, however, they can be helped to see the apostolic role of vowed poverty as it is lived in the Church today. As in every language, the Hebrew vocabulary, too, employed many terms to express the depths of meaning contained in the concept of poverty.

Initially, poverty was understood as a material and sociological condition. The poor man, wretched and needy, was the beseeching one, the beggar. He was oppressed and bowed down by the blows of misery, misfortune, and evil. However, as salvation history progressed, Israel as a nation knew poverty. Through that experience appreciated as a spiritual as well as a sociological reality, the poor man truly became the "biblical man" in his creatural state of petitioner. Terms signifying poverty took on a definite religious meaning expressing the attitudes of a person completely surrendered to God in a trying existential situation. Thus was effected in the words of Barnabas Ahern "the transformation of the vocabulary of poverty into a vocabulary of grace."

Moreover, during the bitter years of exile, Israel's poverty was its hope. Deutero-Isaia holds out this assurance to the captives: "Give praise, O ye heavens, and rejoice, O earth, because the Lord has comforted his people and will have mercy on his poor ones" (Is. 49, 13).

His poor ones—a select group who kept themselves apart in the land of exile became known as the anawim, the Poor-of-Yahweh. Their lot as they resettled in Palestine was one of poverty and discouragement, but it led them to search for God with humility, sorrow, and repentance. Their humility changed

them from "poor men to pious men"; their poverty enriched them. Docile, uncompromisingly open to God, the anawim relied completely on His providence.

Mary, the personification of such spiritual poverty, actualized the prayer and hope of generations of the anawim. Her Magnificat testified to the fact that she considered herself one of them. And one greater than Mary, Christ, described Himself as "meek and humble of heart" in a sentence which scholars tell us reads in Aramaic simply, "I am *anaw*."

Spiritual poverty, then, becomes every Christian, rich and poor. The Church is not the materially poor, but the People of God, rich and poor, animated by a spirit of "radical detachment," the dynamic force of biblical poverty. For the Christian, then, Danielou speaks truly: poverty "is defined essentially in its relation to God, not primarily in relation to material goods or to other men." Only with this understanding can we reconcile the paradox of poverty as a scandal within Christianity, as the glory and strength of God's people. The poverty of the spirit must demolish the poverty of the flesh. To this truth the vowed religious gives visible embodiment and bears eloquent witness.

Solidly grounded in this biblical approach to poverty, our sisters will be able to profit more fully from the courses in economics, history, and sociology which we provide for them. Having grasped the real reasons for seeking first the kingdom of God, they will understand that the search demands total commitment to the "war on poverty." They will learn to see the developing areas of the world as the challenge to the Christian conscience which they are. Their theological grasp of our relationship to all men will be supplemented by the historical sophistication needed to grasp just how far we of the West are responsible for the plight of the rest of the world. They will also appreciate the wisdom of the social teachings of the contemporary Church.

But they will not fall into the grave and omnipresent temptation of twentieth-century thinking so well described by Eric Voegelin when he remarks that today man is striving to construct "a more appealing, more tangible and above all a much easier terrestrial paradise." It is not by seeking to create a terrestrial paradise that man will effectively combat poverty. No. The war on poverty will be victorious only if he maintains vital contact with the transcendent value within which any dynamic social order must function; and those transcendent values, we know, spring from man's relationship to a Transcendent Person. Recognizing this fact, the religious realizes, too, that we are all stewards. We are our brothers' keepers. As James Schall points out, "the criterion by which we are to be judged worthy of eternal life [is] the effective responsibility which [we] have for one another."

The war on poverty thus ceases to be a merely human endeavor. It becomes in practice what it is in reality—a divine mandate. The religious sister may be prevented, by circumstances of God's arranging, from doing as much as her human sympathies would dictate for the material relief of her brothers in Christ; but her vow of poverty places her at the heart of the struggle. Poverty lived in its fullness, calls down on the needy of the earth, the riches of the God who has said: "To whom shall I have respect, but to him who is poor and little, and of a contrite spirit, and that trembleth at my words?" (Is. 66, 2).

Impact: Federal Government Programs on Catholic Graduate Schools

REV. JEROME J. MARCHETTI, S.J.

Executive Vice President, Saint Louis University

THIS STUDY WAS CONDUCTED in the winter of 1963-1964 to determine the extent to which Catholic colleges and universities utilize federal funds made available through various agencies. A questionnaire was sent out to 269 schools and replies were received from 212—a 79 percent return.

The data were analyzed by size of school (enrollment) and in some cases by region of the country, that is, according to states included in each major accrediting association.

The following table show the size (enrollment) and the academic level of the 212 Catholic universities reporting federal funds:

<i>Size</i>	<i>Enrollment</i>	<i>Without Grad. School</i>	<i>With Grad. School</i>	<i>Total</i>
Small school	0-999	132	6	138
Medium school	1,000-4,999	40	22	62
Medium large	5,000-9,999	2	7	9
Large school	10,000 and over	0	3	3
Total		174	38	212

Accreditation by the regional accrediting associations is shown in the following table:

	<i>Without Grad. School</i>	<i>With Grad. School</i>	<i>Total</i>
New England Association	19	3	22
Middle States Association	41	10	51
North Central Association	55	15	70
Northwest Association	3	2	5
Southern Association	15	3	18
Western	3	5	8
No accreditation	38	0	38
Total	174	38	212

The data compiled from the completed, returned questionnaires represent a minimal estimate of the total utilization of federal funds by Catholic colleges and universities. It is a low estimate because not every school which indicated that it was receiving funds specified the amounts. Also, because many schools did not return the questionnaire, estimates of total resource utilization must be explored.

The primary source of federal funds for Catholic institutions of higher education is the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This single agency has provided more than twice the combined total of funds from all other government agencies. This reflects a common need of all schools: money to finance new buildings, particularly dormitories and other housing for students, and probably also for faculty and staff. There is an obvious tendency for larger institutions to receive more funds from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, although small schools do not seem to receive a disproportionate share.

Looking at funds from other government sources, it appears that larger institutions receive larger amounts. This is particularly true for schools with graduate programs, and it leads to the further conclusion that Catholic schools receive federal dollars in proportion to the diversity of their educational offerings. Obviously, in larger Graduate Schools there are more possibilities for research grant and contract applications, for special teaching and other project grants, and for contract administration because personnel and resources are more numerous.

It is well to emphasize, however, that even very small colleges without graduate programs, are, for the most part, able to receive federal monies from nearly every agency specified in the questionnaire.

The study quite clearly indicates the old saw, "The poor get poorer and the rich get richer."

A smaller college should not feel that it is unable to apply for federal funds simply because it has fewer faculty than a larger institution.

Another factor to be considered is the emphases placed on certain programs by the federal government itself. Many agencies emphasize activities appropriate only to larger institutions. For example, the National Institutes of Health, the second largest single source of federal funds for Catholic schools, naturally enough lends support to students and researchers in the health field, to schools with strong programs in the biological sciences, as well as those with programs in medicine, dentistry, and nursing. Thus, NIH has given more money to larger Catholic schools with graduate programs.

By contrast, funds received from the National Defense Education Act (which for the most part excludes the health sciences) seem fairly well divided among schools of all sizes, although those *with* graduate programs receive proportionately more from NDEA than those *without*.

The National Science Foundation, which ranks fourth as a source of funds, offers support for both research and students. Again, larger schools with graduate programs fare better. However, it appears that medium-sized schools receive about the same amount of funds whether or not they have graduate programs.

To recapitulate, research funds seem to go to the larger, more complex institutions rather than to all schools proportionate to enrollment. Training funds seem to go into institutions in proportion to the enrollment. A third major use of federal funds is to support training and administration of special programs, such as the Peace Corps.

Only 3 schools of the 212 schools returning the questionnaire indicated receiving funds from the Peace Corps. None of these was a small school and all had graduate programs, with the corresponding diversity of resources.

Peace Corps programs are examples of services rendered by a university under contract with the federal government to accomplish certain ends that

the government itself is not prepared to undertake except at comparatively greater costs. Nearly every federal agency contracts for some kind of similar work. Smaller schools, it would seem, are simply not in a position to apply for these funds because they do not have the resources, both physical and human, to carry the projects through.

It is probably safe to say that all schools, regardless of size, complexity, or type of control, may utilize federal funds. In fact, it appears that all do to some extent. That some sources of federal funds are "under-used" is probably as much due to the emphasis of the federal agency as it is to the emphasis of the particular college or university. With national emphasis currently on scientific research and training of scientists, it is unlikely that any school which does not emphasize one or both of these would receive federal funds (except for building purposes from the Housing and Home Finance Agency). The least likely recipient of federal funds, then, is a school without a building program, which does not have a strong research orientation, does not emphasize scientific training, or preparation for graduate school, and does not have sufficient resources to render special contracted services to a government agency.

All sources of funds seem to be utilized by most schools. Possible exceptions are new programs instituted by new or existing agencies. Examples of these are the Peace Corps (from which only three schools report receiving funds), and the New Educational Media Research Department of the Office of Education, from which no schools report receiving funds. Although there is a time lag between when funds are made available and when funds are actually awarded to schools, it would seem that better information about the availability of funds would promote applications for them and utilization of them.

• SECTION ON TEACHER EDUCATION

The Why and How of Organizing a Five-Year Program of Teacher Education

REV. DARRELL F. X. FINNEGAN, S.J., PH.D.

Loyola University of Los Angeles

AT THE OUTSET it seems to me that it is important for us to define our terms as to just what is meant by "five-year programs for teachers." It will be necessary to distinguish among at least three different types of programs now being considered as five-year programs, paradoxically basing our distinctions upon what is meant by the "fifth year" in terms of time, prerequisites, course content, and objectives.

1. The first type involves work done after the awarding of the baccalaureate degree in order to obtain state teacher certification. This refers to a *continuous* program which is initiated at the undergraduate level and reaches its *culmination* at the end of the fifth year. We are quite familiar with this type of program in California since for more than forty-five years this has been a requirement for all secondary teachers to obtain their teaching credential.

2. A second type of fifth-year program is one which is intended to be spread over a five-year period (through the use of summer schools, for instance). In such cases a Preliminary Certificate is usually awarded by the state at the end of four years and a Permanent Certificate is awarded upon completion of the total program. It is assumed that the student will be teaching during all this time.

This type, incidentally, is what is now required for elementary teachers in California under the new law which went into effect last January 1. It is not now nor was ever the plan for secondary teachers. The regular secondary credential is not issued until the total "fifth year" is completed except under the Provisional Credential which is considered an exception. The individual cannot obtain one himself; rather, a superintendent has to obtain it after July 1, and after taking an oath that no one fully qualified is available in that particular subject, and also after the candidate had signed a quasi-contract with a college to finish the remaining work needed for the regular credential. Such a Provisional Credential is valid for only two years and renewable only if the specified hours of course work have been completed. This whole system is due to end next July 1. What the State Board of Education will do at that time is anyone's guess. Administrators have already informed the Board that with the great influx of students that we can expect in our schools and the shortage of teachers, especially in some fields, that we will be unable to staff the classrooms except with people holding a Provisional Credential. The California Teachers Association has consistently referred to this as a "sub-standard certification" and wants it terminated.

3. The third type of fifth-year program involves acquisition of a master's degree. The master's may be a straight M.A. in a subject field or an M.S. or M.Ed. in advanced work in professional education courses, such as Administration or Guidance. It may also be a graduate program especially designed for teachers leading to the M.Ed. or the M.A.T. There are, further, two types at least, of the M.A.T. programs: (a) those involving further course work in a teaching field along with advanced professional educational courses (it usually is 30 semester hours, equally divided into the two areas); or (b) those involving subject-matter course work, some Education courses, and "an internship" program.

This brings us to a consideration of the nature and quality or level of work done in a five-year program. Obviously, the first four years are rather clearly of an undergraduate nature and hence the question really involves the work in the fifth year. This final year could be either a time when the student completed his teaching minor field (for secondary students) and took some courses for graduate credit in his major teaching field as well as engaged in observation and student teaching—a program of this type would presuppose it were being built on work done at the undergraduate level in Education as well as in subject-fields—or the fifth year could be a time devoted almost exclusively to professional preparation including student-teaching, with the possible exception of one course each semester for graduate credit in his major. This is sometimes referred to as the "four-plus-one" type of program and assumes the completion of both the teaching major and the teaching minor, but no professional education courses at the undergraduate level. Parenthetically, after fifteen years of the type of fifth year first described, we, at Loyola in Los Angeles, have changed to the four-plus-one type.

Under the old law in California it was very clear that the *quality* or *level* of course work for the first type of fifth year that I have spoken about was

postgraduate (i.e., post-baccalaureate) and could consist of "upper-division and/or graduate courses" but taken in graduate status. The new law is not so clear, except that six hours in the major field must be for graduate credit.

Obviously, work done for any of the master's degrees must be for graduate credit, though institutions differ concerning the amount that is required to be "strictly graduate" (i.e., in courses open only to graduate students) and that which is for graduate *credit* (i.e., taken in courses open also to seniors).

Now that we have seen the types of programs offered in a five-year teacher preparation sequence, we might well consider some of the advantages and disadvantages of each. The whole foundation for the five-year program is, of course, based on the concept that a teacher needs to be a "liberally educated person." If we are to have no quarrel with our brethren in the College of Arts and Science, we must accept as a fact that it is considered necessary to spend four years in various courses for a liberal arts degree. It is true that certain electives are found in every program, but, by and large, the courses are so scheduled each semester, particularly in the upper division, that it is very difficult to achieve a vocational objective while at the same time fulfilling the liberal arts requirements.

As we well know, it was for this reason that historically the Education major came into being. If one is to take this upper-division work largely in the field of Education, he would be able to include his student teaching as part of the major and be free to leave campus to engage in observation, and even student teaching, during his senior year. If, on the other hand, the student is a major in political science, for instance, it may be very difficult to be free for such activities, when, on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at eleven o'clock he has a required course, and, as in most of our institutions, such upper-division courses have but one section and are offered only once during a given day.

For this reason, the arrangement we have had at Loyola of placing student teaching in the fifth year has perhaps shaped our thinking along this line, but, *de facto*, such arrangement has posed no problem to the student who wishes or needs to obtain a liberal arts degree. At the same time, it was felt that as a future teacher he should start thinking about his goal and preparing for it as least in a somewhat remote way. It was realized that in his junior and senior year there would occur specific courses which he could elect within a given major which would be of greater value to him as a future teacher than other courses. For example, it would seem to be a better preparation for a secondary school English teacher to take a course in Advanced Composition rather than one in Shakespeare's Contemporaries, if he had the choice.

In order to provide proper guidance, however, it was essential that the Department of Education and the academic departments be in agreement as to who would be in the program prior to his junior year, if at all possible. Hence, it was required that students make arrangements to "enter the Department of Education" at the end of the sophomore year. They would thus be enabled to receive the proper direction from their academic advisers in their major field, as well as set up a minor (in cases where the institution did not require one for graduation). The student then took the Education courses required in lieu of other electives.

Such an arrangement sounds much better on paper than it sometimes is in reality. Students do not often make up their minds in their earlier years in college and it requires continuous "advertising" to remind them what they must do in terms of their future vocational goals. But granting that the student did know what he was doing, at Loyola we required the student to file a "declara-

tion of intention" to enter the Teacher Education Program, listing a definite major and minor, be interviewed by three members of the Education Staff and a professor in his major field and minor field. In addition, a certain number of psychological tests were taken to be evaluated with him later. His grade-point average had to be at least 2.5 (C +), and as a committee we decided his personality was such that he would make a teacher, as far as we could judge. Thereafter, at registration time both the major professor and the minor professor, who were aware of the fact that certain courses would be more valuable to him, advised him to take them. His first choice, though, after his major requirements, would be the four courses that we offered at the undergraduate level. These were in a given sequence (theoretically) and over the junior and senior years he would be required only to take one each semester. This would permit the fifth year to be free to start a program of Observation at the various levels of public schools (elementary, junior high school, senior high school) during the first semester of the postgraduate year and at the same time finish any work necessary in his minor. During the second semester he engaged in Directed Teaching daily in the morning and concurrently he took a course on Professional Methods. In addition he had room to take one more course at the graduate level.

Such a program was designed to provide him with the requisite depth in his subject-fields and at the same time produce the liberally educated person that we wished. In addition, it was fondly hoped that an "early introduction" to the professional field of Education would keep his enthusiasm aroused sufficiently for him to complete the necessary fifth year. Complications, however, arise in the best of plans. In reality, we found out over the years that most of our students had to work outside of school, and, hence, it was very difficult for them to engage in activities with children in playgrounds or other youth work which would have given more meaning to the theoretical courses in Educational Psychology and the like which they were taking as undergraduates. As far as direct observation of students in classes during their undergraduate years was concerned, it proved almost impossible to schedule such activities without continual conflict with their other courses in their degree program.

As a result, over the years most such hopeful plans went unfulfilled. The students continued to take the Education sequence as seniors, or even as graduate students though these were undergraduate courses. This frequently required an addition of an extra semester in order to complete the undergraduate sequence prior to engaging in the two semesters of graduate work which we considered to be one unit. It is true that the students who persevered had a "long time to prepare" themselves to be teachers. At best, for over three years they belonged to a professional organization (the Student California Teachers Association) and as a result frequently participated in statewide activities with other student teachers. Slowly but surely the student was being formed into "a professional." But the advantages seemed to be outweighed by the disadvantages.

Two factors influenced our decision to change.

1. For some years now there have been meetings to discuss the possibility of change in state requirements for all teacher certification. Having participated in these from the beginning, we became aware of many of the programs in effect in other states and discussed these with our colleagues at length.

2. Since it appears the California schools will be forced to conform to the University of California and the State Colleges when they change from the

semester to the quarter system in 1966, the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences for the past year has had numerous meetings at which a complete curricular revision was discussed. The faculty decided that this would be an appropriate time to look at the content of all the courses in the undergraduate program now offered in the straight-jacket system of credit hours. The result has been an enthusiastic desire for a different type of framework altogether—perhaps the “three term-three course” idea seemed most popular. It soon was apparent to us that such a decision would have its effect upon our own undergraduate program in Education. Eventually, we arrived at a decision to move our professional preparation into the fifth year completely. The student would, therefore, concentrate on his academic preparation during his four undergraduate years and complete both a major and (by using his elective hours in junior and senior years) also a subject-matter minor. Then, just as the students who go to Medical School or Law School devote full time to their specialty, we felt the teachers-to-be would become “professionally minded” if they devoted all of their attention to their professional preparation as teachers in this final year. They will still take one course each semester in their major area for graduate credit but the rest of the time will be devoted to preparing to be teachers.

The program, as now designed, will mean that the student begins his “Observation” in the public schools at the opening of the semester and, half way through his first semester of the fifth year, will begin actual Student Teaching of his minor field. Concurrently with this, he is enrolled in the theory courses which previously he took only at the undergraduate level. A new course entitled “The Sociological, Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Education” has been developed as a 4-semester hour offering and is being conducted by a “team.” It can now be scheduled two days a week on double periods. (Try *that* under the usual undergraduate schedule arrangement.) Another, “The Psychological Foundations of Education” has been moved into the Evening Division. In other words, greater flexibility has been achieved with the whole program. It is felt, also, that much more reality will be brought to these theory courses with the student acutally engaged in visiting schools and, part of the semester, at least, dealing with students directly. In addition, during this semester he is enrolled in a “Professional Colloquy” (for which there is no credit but which is considered to be part of the Directed Teaching course). It is designed to provide opportunity to acquire more knowledge of the teaching profession.

The “Professional Colloquy” will require his attendance at eight 2-hour meetings spread (practically every two weeks) throughout the semester. Arrangements have been made for the professional teachers association (the California Teachers Association) to send a representative out, as well as one from the National Education Association, to discuss with the students the role these organizations play in the schools. In order to be fair it was felt that arrangements also had to be made with the Teachers Union; hence the A.F. of T. has arranged to send a representative to discuss both state-wide and national functions of the Teachers Union. For some years now the California Congress of Parents and Teachers has always sent a representative to describe the activities of that organization and its relation to the teacher. They are happy to continue this arrangement in the new program. The student is also required to make a couple of field trips to the Student California Teachers Association regional meetings. This brings our students into contact with those from other colleges, sometimes even on a state-wide basis, and has done much over the years to promote a mature outlook and a pride in their chosen voca-

tion. The final sessions of the "Colloquy" will involve a presentation made by outstanding alumni of the Department who are now engaged in teaching. Such meetings in the past have always proved very interesting to the students who are able to ask all sorts of questions which they feel the professors of the university are not prepared to answer.

During the second semester of the graduate year, the student will engage in teaching his major every day from the first day of the school term. He will also be enrolled concurrently in what we have called the "Professional Practicum" in his major. This will involve seminar-style meetings for one hour a week, divided according to their major subject-field.

It is recognized that while they will have completed a major in this field for their baccalaureate degree, frequently the practical applications needed for the secondary school level will not have been sufficiently treated. For instance, majors in English will have sessions on Journalism, Reading Problems, Drama, Speech and Debate, and Literature for Adolescents, while at the same time, majors in history will have sessions on geography, civics, World Institutions, Communism, and the like. We plan in each of the major fields to provide the students with the advantages of listening to both public school teachers who are experienced in this field and other specialists as we may be able to obtain them. There is no question here of credit-hour or course requirements, and hence we are not worried about the number of sessions that will be necessary for each topic, but we will try to determine it on interests and needs of the students involved.

In addition to their Directed Teaching, the students are also enrolled in a course entitled "Material, Procedures, and Evaluation of Instruction," during which time they will make intensive study of courses of study and supplementary texts available in their various subject-fields, and the audio-visual resources and now, programmed materials. Procedures and the techniques of presentations for large and small groups, for auto-instructional materials and the like will be covered. Because of time limitations in the course in Educational Psychology we thought that it was necessary to consider the measurement of abilities, achievement, and personality as determined by standardized tests in that course, leaving the treatment of Educational Psychology teacher-made tests for this time in the program. Hence, that segment is put into this course at a time when they are actually engaged in classroom teaching.

In outline, then, this is another type of a continuous fifth-year program and one which we hope will prove valuable to our students.

A different type of five-year teacher preparation program, as was mentioned above, involves the taking of the fifth year over a spread of five years (generally in summer sessions). While in theory, the same program could be taken and the student would undoubtedly profit much by his experience as he went along, the difficulties of implementing such a plan are multiple. It is clearly understood by those with whom I have discussed this that it is practically impossible to require students (now really adults and teachers) to attend one institution for five years, especially after they have received a preliminary certificate and a position. Marriage, better positions, and many other reasons force them to move. As a result, with such mobility the student is inclined merely to take what is convenient at a nearby institution rather than what perhaps would have been the original organized program. For this reason we feel that such a five-year program has inherent dangers within it and as yet I have not heard of any plan which would be able to avoid all of these difficulties.

The final use of the term five-year program for teachers is in reference to a master's program in a subject-field. We are all aware of the fact that the master's degree would provide greater depth in a subject-field but at the same time it would guarantee no specific preparation for the student to enter a classroom. Since in most subject matter, the student is required to devote full time to graduate course work, it hardly seems fair to consider this a "preparation for teaching": it is, rather, preparation for one aspect of teaching, namely the subject matter. If we are to be at all faithful to our work in the field of Education it seems to me that we cannot accept the mere preparation in a subject-field, however essential in the whole, as sufficient to qualify for the term "teacher preparation."

The M.A.T. Program, with an "internship," is one that deserves the attention it has received, but even here one warning would seem to be necessary. *It has always involved very select students and considerable supervision.* In all cases that I know of, it has also involved some type of *foundation support* so that such supervision could be provided. The contract with a given school district to pay a stipend to the student while engaged in the internship, and the necessary supervision that will need to be provided by both the college and the school district, necessarily limits this type of program to a special objective. The work that has been accomplished by such programs has been splendid but it would not seem even in the most optimistic reports to be a substitute for a regular program.

I have not discussed Mr. Conant's statements—for example, "as far as adequate preparation for teaching on the elementary or secondary is concerned, I am certain that four years are enough"—because I believe that his statement is based upon a rather involved theory that electives in the undergraduate baccalaureate program are useless. His plan to obtain a master's degree only in summer sessions is somewhat confused. I will be happy to discuss this should the question arise.

Catholic Teacher Education and Social Leadership

VERY REV. WILLIAM FERREE, S.M., PH.D.

*Assistant General of the Marianists, Office of Apostolic
Action, 22 Via Latina, Rome, Italy*

THE SUBJECT "Catholic teacher education and social leadership" has so many ramifications that it is necessary to clear the ground and define our point of view before entering upon it.

We could consider the process of teacher education itself: What is the form, content, and methodology which will best adjust our teacher education to any social role that it may have? Or we could study the problem of social leadership itself insofar as the teacher is expected to exercise it through the practice of his profession—and this may exhibit radical differences insofar as the teacher is a religious or a lay person. Or, again, we could study the amount and quality of social leadership which is actually being exercised in the world by those who have been trained by Catholic teachers, and thus

arrive at some conclusions as to how well the teachers have been prepared for their task. We might ask ourselves, also, whether Catholic teacher education for social leadership would have to take into account whether the one who receives it intends to teach in a Catholic or in a public school.

Any of these subjects would give us more than enough material for all the time we have at our disposal; yet at the risk of a certain superficiality in treatment, I believe I will best respond to the desires of those who set the theme if I try as much as possible to cover them all from the point of view of any Catholic teacher, religious or secular, who is being prepared for work in the Catholic school system. I will ask you, therefore, to try to view the problem which I will present *as a whole*, without too much insistence on particular details, which can only be illustrative not conclusive, in such summary treatment as we will have to give.

We must, also, be clear on the essential nature of the school itself. There is a considerable body of thought—often claiming descent from Newman's *Idea of a University*—which maintains that the principal determinant of the nature and work of the school is its *limitation* to intellectual goals: the school's business is to train the mind. It is true that this training will later be used to confront life's problems, challenges, and opportunities; but these latter are not themselves the object of education, so that they cannot be introduced extensively into the process without loading it down with frills at the expense of the fundamentals.

This limitation of objective, which prides itself on its devotion to the fundamentals, has at least the great advantage of simplicity and clarity. However, I am afraid it breaks down in the face of a single question which is equally clear and simple: *Do we educate minds or do we educate people?* If it is people we educate, they are more than minds, and our instruction must be more than academic.

We could argue this question, of course; but I believe there is a further question which makes the argument quite unnecessary: Can education be *Catholic* and purely academic? I submit that it cannot be: that it must go far beyond the *bonum secundum quid* which is characteristic of the intellectual virtues when they stand alone. This paper, therefore, presupposes that education is for life, not for brilliance. Not that I have anything against brilliance: as a quality of achievement in substantive goals, I am all for it; and the more we have of it in Catholic education the better, as befits our higher goals. But it must be a quality of *achievement* in the goals of life, not an end in itself.

My reason for giving so much time to this when time is precious, is that I feel we are here face to face with one of the greatest problems of Catholic education: We must in our teaching as well as in our teacher-training, *integrate*, much better than we have in the past, the two great dimensions of the teacher's task, its excellence as a professional process and its effectiveness in giving form and shape to life. Furthermore, when we think of Catholic life, we must have in mind its apostolic dimension as well as its individual one, after the manner of Pope Pius XI, whose most frequently repeated phrase was probably this one: "Catholic Action is Catholic life."

The importance of this integral vision is not only theoretical: the cost of Catholic education becomes an ever-increasing burden as its services are improved and expanded, and above all as it calls increasingly on the laity for its teachers; and neither the Catholic people, on whom the burden ultimately rests, nor the Catholic institutional structure, which must be adjusted to it, will continue to support that growing burden on academic grounds alone.

Alternative solutions are available for the academic problem, if that is all that is at stake.

And so we come back to our title. When we say "Catholic teacher education and social leadership," we intend to indicate a positive and necessary correlation between the two terms, and we intend to accept as a failure the absence of such a correlation. With this in mind, let us review a few developments that seem significant. It should be noted that what I report here are general impressions drawn from personal experience, not the carefully controlled results of objective research.

1. There is a quite general impression that existing Catholic leadership tends to develop among Catholics who have had to face a neutral or hostile environment during their formative years, rather than among those who have had the presumed advantage of education in a Catholic institution. This is particularly true of such leadership qualities as awareness of problems, initiative and energy in response to them, and willingness to accept personal sacrifices.

2. To be specific, there is alleged to be a deficiency of representation of Catholic institutions in volunteer service such as that of the lay missionary movements and the Peace Corps. There is some evidence, however, that this was rather a "time lag" than a permanent deficiency, and that representation from Catholic institutions is now increasing.

3. Parish and diocesan authorities frequently complain that Catholic graduates do not "carry their weight" in the leadership of their Catholic communities. Here it is not clear that a distinction is made between graduates of Catholic and non-Catholic institutions; but resentments seem to be directed principally against the Catholic ones, probably on the grounds that more should be expected of them, or that greater sacrifices were made for them.

4. There is a general feeling, both inside and outside the Church, that Catholic leadership tends to be negative rather than constructive. It responds much more readily to specific items which it is "against" than to the much more fundamental work of building better social institutions. Insofar as this is true, it is a particularly severe indictment of Catholic education since it is only the latter which could give the vision and ideals necessary for a more constructive orientation.

5. It is remarked with surprise, especially by Europeans accustomed to working with considerably less resources, that American Catholic leadership has not managed to develop a daily press. They look upon this as abdication of an important field of public debate. Our specifically religious press, usually appearing weekly, does not supply this need; so that an important dimension of our leadership seems to be missing.

6. It is recognized that the above points are merely indicative, and that all of them could be discussed. On the other hand, it would not be difficult to lengthen the list considerably. In order to get on with our task, let us take two developments that are both more general and more conclusive.

The first is the peculiar difficulty we have experienced in this country (where Catholic institutions at the college and university level are more developed than anywhere else in the world) to develop a national Catholic student leadership. Because I was impressed with this problem, I had some part, over twenty-five years ago, in the foundation of the National Federation of Catholic College Students, and have followed its work with considerable

interest in the intervening years. I believe it is fair to say that its influence has been decreasing in recent years, and that at present it reaches only the smaller campuses. I found it particularly instructive to follow the debates which preceded the withdrawal of the students on the larger campuses over the years. The single question most often asked—and the one which seems usually to have been decisive—was “What does it do for us?” There simply does not seem to have been any appreciation of the fundamental fact that such an organization is an *instrument* for the formation and exercise of leadership, not a sort of Santa Claus or nursemaid whose sole function is to keep its clients contented.

Another aspect of the same problem is the way in which the student apostolate becomes less well-organized from the high school into the college, and from the college into graduate school, until in the latter it all but disappears. We are not referring here to the Newman Clubs, since by definition they are not the outcome of Catholic teaching efforts. On the Catholic campuses it is very close to the truth that the organized apostolate diminishes in direct proportion as the student acquires more potentiality for leadership—that is, as he advances through lower levels of education to the successful acquisition of a graduate degree. In other countries, where the scarcity of Catholic institutions of higher education throws almost all students into a sort of “Newman Club” situation, the great strength of the Catholic student movements is precisely on the level of the graduate school.

7. Finally, let us consider a much more general phenomenon which is a real “clinker” for illustrating our problem. In the new and developing countries of Asia and Africa, the “mission” school system often played a very large part in the total educational opportunities of the country. We thought ourselves justified in supposing that when these countries became independent, Christian leadership would be important in them out of all proportion to the actual percentage of Christians in the population, since such a large proportion of the educated classes had attended the mission schools.

As a matter of fact, much to our surprise, national leadership has most often come from levels of “popular leadership” below the educated classes; and what we seem to have created is a race of minor bureaucrats rather than authentic leaders. Of course, minor bureaucrats have their uses, and the expected preponderance of Christian influence does show up in the representation of the newer countries in such agencies of the United Nations as the Food and Agricultural Organization. Monsignor Ligutti, who is the official observer of the Vatican at the world headquarters of the Food and Agricultural Organization at Rome, claims that the majority of the representatives from the newer countries is, in fact, Christian, and often Catholic. Unfortunately, he concludes this bit of statistical information with a chilling comment: “But,” he says, “if you want to discuss a social problem, don’t go to them.”

It seems, indeed, that this immense effort of Catholic education in the mission lands has lacked a social dimension. There is no question of its effectiveness in the individual order. The schools have been most effective in imparting a better knowledge of the Faith and a more loyal attachment to it in the individual students who have passed through them; and through the presence of such individuals, there is no question but that the young Churches have been greatly strengthened. But this is quite a different thing from the formation of social leadership which is the subject of this discussion.

What is particularly interesting in this example taken from the newly independent countries is that any failure cannot be attributed to this or that

teaching society. It must be attributed to Catholic education as a whole, since almost all teaching societies are involved in the missionary effort.

This brings us to a fundamental question which has already been raised, and which will certainly become more insistent in the measure in which trends and influences already in motion have time to work themselves out. The question runs somewhat as follows: "Since we are in what is known to history as an age of transition—and even of revolutionary change—our greatest obligation both to the Church and to society is to try to direct the changes that are taking place and to give a Christian orientation to the new world that is being born. This demands the marshaling of tremendous personnel and material resources by a Christendom that is already under heavy pressures. Now, Catholic education ties up more resources than any other activity of the Church, and it is not clear that it is relevant to this greatest task of our times. Why not employ directly in the task of social reorientation and reorganization a considerable part of the resources now frozen in the brick and mortar of our schools, and of the scarce personnel now withdrawn behind that brick and mortar?"

In fact, I have several times heard a well-known authority on Catholic Social Action in the United States insist that if he could have only half of the personnel and resources now immobilized in the schools, he could assure a Christian society for the future. As I am a great believer in the power and efficacy of Catholic Social Action myself, I do not intend to try to dispute this claim. I do want, however, to put it back in the only context in which I believe it has meaning.

As it stands, it is a claim for the efficacy of direct social action as *against* a lesser efficacy for the schools. I would like to suggest, instead, that whatever superiority direct social action can claim really *presupposes the work of the schools*. The statement I have reported above sounds good because it is made in the United States—which happens to be the country where the most highly developed Catholic school system in the world has been at work for generations. If it were transferred, let us say, to Latin America, where there has been little or no Catholic education for the great masses of the people, I venture to say that it would hardly cause a ripple in the course of events. It is supremely important that those who criticize Catholic education should not take its results for granted in plans which weaken its role. Those results in the individual order, as has already been pointed out, are impressive; and our best solution is to keep these results while *adding* the formation to social leadership which is now so often lacking.

In theory, the school is not only an adequate instrument for the formation of this leadership, but it is the best instrument imaginable. No other human institution except the family can hope for so long and so intensive an action on the developing personality; no other relationship in life is so expressly and so directly formative as that between teacher and student; no other profession than teaching, among those which intend to serve human development, is so consciously and so broadly based on research for its methods and its objectives; and no other has comparable experience in the "placement" of young people according to their abilities and according to their potentialities. Besides the inherent possibilities of the academic program for making the student aware of the kind of world he lives in and of the possibility of making it better, the teacher has an almost unlimited choice among cocurricular and extracurricular activities to put together a sort of laboratory program of actual leadership in the student milieu, which can be transformed gradually as the student gets older into a sort of "advanced

placement" program in the problems and aspirations of the world of adults. It is the school's business to present and interpret the achievements and problems of the past in terms relevant to the present and the future; and, in this activity, it becomes a veritable collaboration between generations in passing on the vision of what life must be to be good.

These advantages, and others which could be mentioned, give the teacher a unique opportunity to turn out well-formed leaders who know the problems of society and are willing to work at them. Why, then, does not the teacher do a better job? Why does not the school live up to its theoretical position as not only an *adequate* instrument but the *best* we can possibly have?

The answer, I believe, is surprisingly simple: Despite its theoretical advantages, the school and the teacher are subject to a whole series of "occupational hazards" that have to be known and guarded against if good results—or even passable ones—are to be achieved. Let us review a few of these hazards.

1. Teaching is a highly technical pursuit, and is becoming more so with every new rule of certification, with every new state requirement, with every advance in theory and method, and with every new teaching aid. This steady descent from philosophy to mechanics may very well enable us to cope with problems of mass education of which an older and simpler age could have had no suspicion; but it is definitely *hard on vision*, and without vision there is no leadership, nor any formation for it.

2. Teaching is also highly professionalized, and is likely to put its mark on the men and women who engage in it. They must deal constantly with immaturity, and may acquire a tendency to regard it as a permanent characteristic of those around them instead of as a passing phase in the life of their students; their business is to know, and they may have a tendency to know even things that aren't so; they are very likely to have the answers before the questions are clearly formulated; their passion for clarity and for summing up may give them a taste for simplicity even in the social order, where it is almost never found. I sometimes wonder if it is not possible to tell a teacher almost as far away as one can tell a beatnik. At any rate, when I check up on how well one is doing in a different kind of work on a continent where no one knows him from Adam, I am not at all surprised if I get the criticism—and it is frankly intended to be critical—that he "acts like a teacher." Obviously, insofar as one allows himself to become fossilized in this way, his capacity for attracting and influencing potential leadership diminishes.

3. Teaching is absorbing: it takes all the men you have for all the time there is. Thus, it is difficult to confront new problems when all of one's resources are already committed, and it is difficult to leave room in workloads for activities which are not clearly a part of the administrative or academic task.

4. The school is an ivory tower which effectively shuts out the more strident problems of the outside world. It must assure to the students freedom from distractions and time to think; and this would be difficult if current problems of the world were allowed too easy access. Normally, the world's problems must come in through the textbooks; and textbooks tend to specialize in problems that are already pretty far on the way to being solved. Some more bitter critics maintain that they contain the problems which the author learned when he went to school.

5. Teaching has the peculiar possibility of being able to concentrate on subject matter that one teaches, instead of on the people who are being taught. Perhaps this is simply a facet of the "technical" defect already noted in our first point; but, even so, it merits special attention. It is perfectly possible, for instance, for a body of Yankees to move into South America somewhere, set up a school with all the courses and texts used in their last establishment in the states, and teach in English for twenty years without ever learning to speak the language of the country! This possibility—unfortunately, sometimes actually realized in practice—exists only because pure subject-matter teaching can still be useful to the ones who receive it; though why anyone would be willing to spend his life *giving* it, I cannot imagine.

6. If not watched, certain rather secondary aspects of the educator's task tend to displace much more fundamental aspects. I would certainly regard it as one of the fundamentals that students be brought to stand squarely on the two feet of their own responsibility; and that they be motivated from within by principles on which they build their lives. Yet, there is a tendency among teachers, and I would say especially among Catholic teachers, to substitute external protection for responsibility, and moral pressure for motivation. Such substitutions are death to leadership, even though they might be defended up to a certain point in the individual order.

7. This list could go on, but let us close it arbitrarily with one more pitfall that is especially likely to be an "occupational hazard" for religious teachers. As religious, they profess a certain withdrawal from the world which 99 percent of their students, who will choose the secular life, are not going to share. This fact can be the basis of a certain anti-clericalism in education, as in the case of a rather famous Spanish bishop who said that Spain had never learned to govern itself because so many of its teachers were religious. Strangely enough, the recent massive introduction of secular teachers into the Catholic schools has not been an automatic remedy: They seem more likely to follow the pedagogical practices of the religious than to set up new ones of their own.

I do not believe there is any great need to show how each of these "occupational hazards" of our Catholic schools could lessen their power to train leaders, or how all of them together could be disastrous. It is sufficient to point out that our Catholic teacher-training institutions ought to be on the lookout for such things, and ought to have, or to find, solutions for them. I am not going to be so foolish as to try to do their work for them in this brief talk; but this paper would not be complete if it did not at least make an attempt to suggest some lines along which solutions should be sought.

First of all, we need a much greater effort to give an *integral vision* of our task as Christian educators. The very term "Christian" educator already deals with the ends or purposes of life. It cannot be equated with mere academic instruction, which is only one of the means—even though one of the principal means—of education. I, myself, have abundant occasions to encounter the lack of integration which is characteristic of our outlook at present. As Assistant General in charge of Apostolic Action of a religious society largely devoted to teaching, it is my business to keep insisting on the apostolic goals for which our instruction is a means. I make it a point never to speak on the apostolate without insisting that any teaching which professes to serve it must be *technically good* teaching; that no school can

carry out a truly apostolic mission if it is not a *good* school. Yet, I am still waiting for the first occasion when my talks do not arouse the resentment of some of the older religious (including some provincial officers) because I am trying "to abandon the classroom," or the enthusiasm of some of the young religious who want to know my timetable for abandoning it. I have by now had enough contact with other teaching societies to know that they have the same trouble; and in some countries of Europe, vocations to the teaching societies seem to be falling off in direct proportion to the growth of enthusiasm for the apostolate.

This is all wrong! It remains true today, as it has always been, that if we were deliberately to set ourselves the task of examining every human institution in order to find the one best suited to the task of leadership formation, we would decide finally on the school—even after knowing the poor record and enumerating the occupational hazards! It suffices to review again the reasons we have already given. Surely so remarkable a potentiality is worthy of the attention of our teacher-training institutions; and I am beginning to believe that only these institutions—which obviously share the advantages of the school in general—have sufficient "grip" on the formation of teachers to end the false dichotomy ("classroom" or "apostolate") which has been set up in our minds.

Our teacher-training institutions should impress upon our future teachers the fundamental principle which is set forth in one of the early articles of the Apostolic Constitution *Sedes Sapientiae*: the training for the apostolate should begin during the first years of formation, and continue throughout it at a constantly increasing rhythm until the passage into the active apostolate is made, as it were, naturally and without an abrupt break.

Specifically, this means that students approaching the obligations of adult life should already be introduced in some fashion, during the last year of schooling, into the adult organizations in which they will be expected to meet these obligations. All too often, student apostolic activity remains totally linked with the school right up to graduation; and when the school disappears from life at that point, the apostolate disappears with it. Teachers in training should be warned of this; and they should already be placed in effective contact with the adult organizations they will need in their work. This should be considered as much a part of the educational process as vocational guidance or job placement, both of which look toward the life that the student will live after he leaves the school.

Teachers in training should be encouraged to establish meaningful contacts with apostolic and social organizations during their professional life, just as they are now encouraged to establish such contacts with their professional organizations. The reasons are the same in both cases, from the professional point of view; and besides, the teacher has his own obligations toward society as an adult member of it.

Teachers in training should be given some understanding of the kind of world in which they will do their teaching. The implications of a "transitional period of history" for their work should be made clear to them. They should have some perspective against which they can judge the speed and depth of the technical and social changes through which the world is passing, and the implications which these changes have for the "building" of the Church which will be expected from their students. This will mean that they, themselves, become personally aware of social problems and personally involved in their solution; for the law that *Nemo dat quod non habet* has not yet been repealed. I should think that a lecture series which brings really out-

standing leaders to the campus should be standard procedure in a teacher-training institution.

Full advantage should be taken of the modern insight into social direction which we now have as a result of Pope Pius XI's doctrine of Social Justice and Social Charity; and of the great advances that have been made in our century in the theory of administration. Some exposure to theories of group dynamics is also in order. All these things are the anatomy of leadership, and should be known by those whose business it will be to train the generation from which future leaders must come.

Finally, I would suggest that those institutions which train religious teachers give serious attention that almost all the teaching they do will be a preparation of human beings for the secular life. They must have enthusiasm and high ideals for their own religious life; but not at the expense of the secular life for which they must train almost all their students.

PROCEEDINGS OF BUSINESS MEETING, APRIL 2, 1964

RELATIONSHIP OF THE SECTION ON TEACHER EDUCATION TO THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT

Brother Louis J. Faerber, S.M., Chairman, reported on the reapproval of the following official standing of the Section on Teacher Education as it is designed to function within the College and University Department of the National Catholic Educational Association.

The statement was originally drawn up in January, 1954, for the purpose of not only clarifying the relationship with the College and University Department but also to provide some "machinery" whereby the section could function efficiently.

The members of the original committee responsible for the statement were sisters who were identified with the section from its origin in 1948, namely: Sister Mary Peter, O.P.; Sister Mary Augustine, O.S.F.; Sister Mary Teresa Francis, B.V.M.; Sister Mary Joseetta, R.S.M., *Chairman*.

Brother Louis Faerber reported that the original statement was resubmitted to the College and University Department through Brother Gregory, F.S.C., and received reapproval as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE: Within the framework of the College and University Department of the NCEA, the objectives of the Section on Teacher Education are defined as follows:

1. To stimulate interest in the education of both religious and lay teachers for Catholic schools.
2. To promote high standards of teacher formation.
3. To provide an open forum for the discussion of problems related to the education of both religious and lay teachers.
4. To initiate studies to explore problems related to the education of teachers for Catholic schools.
5. To formulate recommendations regarding the education of teachers for referral to higher authorities through the duly authorized channel—the Executive Board of the College and University Department.

MEMBERSHIP: Those persons whose positions give them a special responsibility for the education of teachers for Catholic schools constitute the membership of this section.

OFFICERS: The officers of this section are a chairman, vice chairman, and secretary. These officers constitute the executive committee of the section. They serve for a period of two years.

The chairman shall (1) preside at all general meetings; (2) be responsible for the program to be presented at the national meetings; (3) coordinate the business of the section; (4) act as the official representative of the section.

The vice chairman shall assist the chairman and shall assume her duties in her absence.

The secretary is responsible for the records and for the official correspondence and communications of the section.

MEETINGS: The section shall meet as a group at the annual national meeting of the NCEA.

The executive committee and other committees meet when necessary.

COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS: The activities of the section are carried on by the committees and commissions appointed by the chairman when need and/or the opinion of the members of the section warrant.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The nominating committee was composed of the following members: Rev. R. A. Bernert, S.J.; Sister Merici, O.S.U.; Sister M. Augustine, O.S.F., *Chairman*.

Sister M. Augustine reported that the committee met in the Carolina Room, Chalfonte Hotel, Atlantic City, New Jersey, at 1:45 P.M. Tuesday, March 31, 1964. The following slate of officers incumbent for the next two years was submitted as follows:

Chairman: Sister Rosemary, D.C., President, St. Joseph College, Emmitsburg, Maryland.

Vice Chairman: Rev. E. J. La Mal, O.Praem., St. Norbert College, West De Pere, Wisconsin.

Secretary: Sister Maureen, S.S.N.D., Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

The motion for acceptance of these nominees was seconded and was endorsed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

BROTHER LOUIS J. FAERBER, S.M., *Chairman*
Teacher Education Section, NCEA

Foreign Student Advising on the Catholic Campus

REV. GERARD F. YATES, S.J.

Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

THIS IS THE FIRST TIME that NCEA has ever addressed itself to this specific field of interest. I have, therefore, decided that, as the first speaker on this panel, I should try to put the problem of the foreign student on the Catholic campus in its proper perspective. So I shall begin with the general subject of:

1. THE FOREIGN STUDENT IN THE UNITED STATES

According to *Open Doors, 1963* (New York: Institute of International Education, 1963), 64,705 foreign students were enrolled in institutions of higher learning in the United States during the academic year 1962-63, an increase of 11 percent over the previous year. "In one decade the number has increased by 75 percent. If the present trend continues," we are told, "the number will reach 100,000 by 1970." (*The College, The University & the Foreign Student*. New York: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1963, p. 4.)

These students come in increasing numbers from the new nations of the underdeveloped areas. There is a new look on our campuses, with men and women from every continent, colorful costumes, and a babel of tongues between classes. More and more they are sponsored by their own governments, or by ours, or by various private agencies. Last year, just over 5,000 were sponsored by the U.S. Government alone; 26,500 were self-supporting; 11,375, or 17.5 percent by U.S. colleges and universities; and the other 18,000 by various combinations of public and private funds.

Just over half (51.3 percent) are undergraduates; 44.6 percent are graduates; and about 4 percent are special students or unclassified. They study a wide spectrum of fields. Engineering engages 22 percent or some 14,000. The humanities and the natural sciences are close rivals, with 18.5 percent and 17.2 percent respectively. Then come the social sciences with 14.9 percent. They studied in 1805 different institutions. But 40 percent were in the 32 universities that reported over 400 foreign students.

The largest area represented is the Far East, with 36.7 percent; then comes Latin America (17 percent), the Near and Middle East (13.7 percent), and Europe (12.2 percent). Africa numbers only 7.7 percent, or just under 5,000; but the count for sub-Sahara Africa has risen 300 percent in the past 10 years, 27 percent in the past year.

I know that in a presentation such as this, statistics are very difficult to catch on the fly. I offer only a few of the most important, hoping that they will create for you at least a general sense of numerical magnitude and growth. They are the background of a key statement in the Morrill report, *The University and World Affairs*:

Our age has been characterized as being the first in history to recognize the

practical possibility of having all peoples throughout the world share in the fruits of civilization. At such a time, education, including international education, has been catapulted into the position of a major determinant in the dynamics of social change. Human welfare everywhere depends upon the conjunction of technological power and democratic freedoms. Without the first, men are slaves to nature; without the second, slaves to one another. Neither is possible without education. Neither can be advanced without the organized scholarship that is characteristic of great universities. (New York: Ford Foundation, p. 14.)

2. THE FOREIGN STUDENT ON THE CATHOLIC CAMPUS

Our Catholic institutions are deeply involved in this rapidly changing picture. In 1962-63, the number of foreign students on our campuses grew from 5,549 the previous year to 6,184—an increase of 11.5 percent. Sixty-three percent are undergraduates (versus 51.3 percent generally¹); 25 percent are graduates (versus 44.6 percent; 12 percent are special or unclassified (versus 4 percent). In major fields, 29 percent are in humanities; 15 percent and 15 percent in social and natural sciences, respectively; 11.5 percent in business, and 9 percent in engineering.

It is significant and gratifying to report that 1,231, or 19.9 percent, of these were on scholarships from their Catholic college or university versus 17.5 percent for the general total. Another 20.8 percent received support from outside agencies, including government or a combination of government and their own private Catholic institutions. This is significantly less than the comparable general figure of 31.3 percent, but this discrepancy probably reflects the fact that few Catholic universities offer some of the fields in which very many foreign students wish to engage, such as engineering, agriculture, and the health sciences. A total of 2,518 students, or 41 percent, received some kind of support versus 59 percent of the general total.

The students were scattered among 216 campuses, but 51.8 percent of them were concentrated in 13 institutions which numbered from 102 to over 500 foreign students. Yet, there were 32 campuses with 21 to 50 foreign students, and 7 more with 51 to 100 students, which are substantial concentrations.

One significant variation from the general pattern is that the largest group of foreign students on Catholic campuses comes from Latin America (Central and South America and the Caribbean). The number is 2,274, or 37 percent of the total, versus 17 percent of the general figure. Next comes the Far East—29 percent. The increase in African students is slightly greater than for the country at large: 28 percent versus 27 percent in the past year. The presence of such a large number of Latin Americans is of obvious importance to Catholic institutions in this country. (Source of figures: *Foreign Students in Catholic Colleges and Universities 1962—1963*, NCEA.)

3. IN SEARCH OF A FOREIGN STUDENT POLICY

Until World War II, the foreign student in this country was most likely to be a fairly affluent European or Asiatic, or a very affluent Latin American, often with United States connections, generally familiar with English, as much in search of a broadening experience as education in the strict sense. That picture is no longer true to life. And while it still pleases some deans and other officials to say, "We have no foreign students—only students," this

¹ Throughout this paper, the comparison is of foreign students in *Catholic institutions* with foreign students in *all* U.S. institutions, and "generally" means the entire foreign student enrollment in higher education in the United States.

is, in my view, a very unrealistic slogan. The special problems of foreign students have been well summarized as follows:

Foreign students do have problems and concerns that are different—some in kind, some merely in degree—from those of American students. Some are legal and mundane; a foreign student needs a passport from his own government and a visa from ours to get here, for example; an American does not. Others are serious and profound; differences in culture, in language, in academic preparation, in social customs. (*The College, the University and the Foreign Student*, op. cit., p. 9.)

A complete treatment would include problems of selection and admission, evaluation procedures, financial guaranties, and so forth. Much is being done in these areas by IIE and other agencies. I would rather single out certain campus problems that face a student on arrival. (The English problem will receive special attention in this panel.)

a. In general, the new arrival will not know much about American life—political, social, educational. The complex organization of the American campus, its administrative jargon, its paradoxes of freedom and formalities, are truly bewildering. Housing and eating arrangements, taken for granted by Americans, are often not so simple to the stranger.

But when the campus drill is mastered, the strange ways of American life remain puzzling. It is often hard to ask questions—even such simple ones as where to go to church. The stranger needs a kind of continuing orientation.

b. Here is where sustained, active interest by fellow students is of great importance in providing both instant answers to questions as well as building bridges from campus to community. What student and community organizations are ready and competent to offer this service? On some campuses, the University People-to-People group is very helpful, but, in general, American student interest is low.

c. Foreign students, at least in their first year, require more academic counseling than others. The greatest responsibility that the American university owes the foreign student is to give him the best education possible. Many other factors bear on the institution's ability to do so, but at the heart of the problem is academic advising. Each institution should utilize qualified faculty advisers who are much more than program-signers. The more the advisers know about the culture from which the student comes, the better. They should be conversant with the kind and quality of education the student has already received. How aware of this need are deans, and how concerned are they to meet it?

d. Personal counseling is also of great importance. Obviously, personal problems and academic problems are often reciprocally related. But there should be someone available who has the touch, the understanding to help the foreign student cope with crises never felt before.

There is the sheltered girl from Peru who is unable to fit into a new and complex social pattern. There is the Pakistani who is hurt and infuriated at being refused an apartment because of his "race." There is the orthodox Moslem who, suddenly questioning everything he has ever believed, finds himself deeply troubled. The adviser must deal with each of these problems—and he must also have the sense to realize when he cannot deal with them and must instead send the student to a more specialized counsellor. . . . (*The College, the University and the Foreign Student*, p. 17.)

To meet these and other needs, a new academic specialist has evolved, particularly in the years since World War II—the Foreign Student Adviser—and a professional organization has developed: the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, inevitably known as NAFSA. The Foreign Student Adviser, usually referred to as the FSA, has been humorously described:

A foreign student counselor at a large university is a person who was appointed from the faculty, carries a doctor's degree in history, English, Spanish, international law, hotel management, Chinese, or divinity, has had experience in a foreign country anywhere from 30 years in China to one day in Canada.

He wears several hats: as counselor, program director, lecturer, chairman of a committee, typist, file clerk, author, pseudo-lawyer, pseudo-doctor, pseudo-psychologist, mimeograph operator, carpenter, janitor, and official greeter for the university of Kings, Shahs, Queens, Cabinet Ministers and professors of papyrology and fisheries.

He is expected to at least say hello, goodbye, and a few curses in not many more than 80 languages. He has a painful familiarity in immigration law, income-tax law, selective service law, criminal law, and civil history, political science, sociology, geography and international finance . . . All in all, he must be all in all. (ROBERT B. KLINGER, University of Michigan, International Center, President of NAFSA, 1964-1965.)

In the most complete study thus far attempted of the work of the FSA, sixteen activities are distinguished in which many FSA's engage, from admissions through immigration rules to community contacts. (HOMER D. HIGBEE, *The Status of Foreign Student Advising*, Lansing: Michigan State University, p. 11.) On some large campuses, the FSA is the director of an international office with responsibility for a variety of programs involving international exchange. It is more and more recognized that the FSA must be closely related to the admissions process for foreign students. In some institutions he has the final authority to issue the I-20 form, without which an applicant cannot obtain a student visa. This procedure has much to recommend it. The competent FSA aims at professional skill in evaluating a student's preparation. He should know where to secure information on institutions abroad, how to anticipate the new student's problems and interpret a new culture to him. He should be familiar with community resources available to the foreign student; he should also protect him from the importunate or the exploiter—however well-intentioned. He is definitely not a kind of cruise director in the groves of Academe, acting as M.C. for a costume parade.

4. WHAT ARE CATHOLIC INSTITUTIONS DOING?

A survey covering the current academic year gives a general answer to this question. A total of 183 institutions replied, 15 of which have no foreign students enrolled. A thorough analysis of the questionnaire has not yet been completed, but some interesting figures stand out.

Of the total number of institutions participating, only 52—less than one-third—are members of NAFSA. Only three have a full-time FSA: one of these teaches a special course of English to less than twenty foreign students, and specifies no other FSA activities—hardly an FSA in the accepted sense. Several institutions with appreciable numbers of foreign students (in the forties and up to nearly one hundred) apparently offer very little special help to foreign students beyond assistance with visa problems.

One of the questions dealt with the amount of time given to foreign student work by the FSA. One hundred and twenty-six stated that they gave less than one-fourth of their time to it. Now, 121 respondents enroll fewer than 20 foreign students; but one FSA with over 200 gives less than a fourth of his time to this work; another, with just about 100, is in the same situation, and a third, with nearly 300, manages only to give 25 percent of his time to it. This surely suggests inadequate administrative arrangements, probably on the part of the president or dean of the institutions concerned. And there are fourteen institutions which enroll foreign students but have no FSA.

The NAFSA members surveyed make a much better showing in organization and activities than the nonmembers. Don't get the impression that this group is composed of all the larger institutions. Of the fifty-one Catholic institutional members of NAFSA, thirty-four have 30 or fewer foreign students, divided almost equally into tens. Between the count of 31 and 150 foreign students, there are only ten more institutions; above 150 there are eight. Of the nonmembers, thirteen have between 21 and 50 foreign students, three between 51 and 100, one has over 100, and another has over 200. One of these larger institutions apparently has a well-developed foreign student program.

I have always believed that educators who draw their inspiration from religious convictions have a special responsibility in the realm of international education. As Americans, we surely recognize a patriotic motive for our activities in this field. "Many nations seek the help of American universities to strengthen the foundation of their educational system," the Morrill report points out (*The University and World Affairs*, p. 38). Besides, our contribution to the defense of the free world should not only be arms and money but also ideas and principles. No educator can be insensitive to these considerations.

But as Christians, too, we should be particularly aware of our responsibility to our brethren from abroad. "I was a stranger and you welcomed me," we hope to hear the great Judge say (Mt. 25, 35). Historically, it was a Christian world that gave birth to the universities; and in old days, students moved back and forth across the Alps and the Channel and the whole face of Europe in search of masters and learning. In our time, we have been admonished by the late Pope John:

Certainly relations between states must be regulated by the norms of truth and justice, but they also derive great benefits from active solidarity. This solidarity can be achieved through mutual cooperation on various levels, such as in our own times has already taken place with laudable results in the economic, social, political, educational, health and sport spheres. (*Pacem in Terris*, America Press ed., par. 98.)

And elsewhere in the same great essay:

Once again We . . . remind our children of their duty to take an active part in public life and to contribute toward the attainment of the common good of *the entire family* as well as that of their own political community. They should endeavor, therefore, in the light of their Christian faith and led by love, to insure that the various institutions—whether economic, social, cultural, or political in purpose—should be such as not to create obstacles, but rather to facilitate or render less arduous man's perfecting of himself. (*Ibid.*, par. 146; italics inserted).

After such inspiring language, my recommendations may seem an anticlimax. They are nonetheless valid and within the realm of the possible:

1. Every college or university enrolling foreign students should become an institutional member of NAFSA. The slight cost will be more than compensated by the publications and services that NAFSA provides. The institution should, moreover, play an active role in NAFSA at least on the regional level.

2. Every institution enrolling more than 20 or 25 foreign students should have a specially designated Foreign Student Adviser, chosen with care, provided with the necessary facilities—and time—and given loyal support by his president and dean.²

3. American students and community groups should be encouraged to bring the foreign student into American life, on and off the campus, in ways that will complement his academic experience. Here, cooperation with non-Catholic groups can be most fruitful.

One final observation. I have the impression that Catholic activity in the area under discussion has not been great. One sometimes feels that it has almost been grudging. Of late, there has been a sudden surge of interest. One fears that there will be a flurry of organizing, the creation of new groups, the repeating of old mistakes. I hope that we will not take this path. I hope rather we will join our efforts with those of already established groups like NAFSA, ISS,³ and many local community groups. We have a great deal to learn from them. They will welcome our collaboration, generous and loyal as it will surely be.

The Needs of Foreign Students

REV. PETER DE LA GARZA

*Director, Latin American Secretariat for Academic Affairs,
Washington, D.C.*

UNDERSTANDING the Latin American students is, in a sense, visualizing the problem of Latin America in regard to higher education. An effort on our part should be made to grasp the magnitude of the problems these students had to face in their own countries as well as the circumstances which surround these problems.

It can also be said that, if a certain degree of understanding of the Latin American students is achieved in the American colleges and universities, the problems of the Latin American nations will be recognized more easily.

Here are some aspects to consider in our study today:

The Latin American student is a temporary emigrant in this land. It is well known that the student emigrates—from his native village to the most important cities, and from there on to other countries—in search of education. He goes wherever he encounters answers which satisfy his intellectual restlessness and can, at the same time, offer human satisfaction. He sees education and the development of human resources as basic to the solution

² A colleague who is FSA in a college which enrolls 24 foreign students urges me to drop the number from 20 to 15. I hope that neither of us is over-optimistic.

³ International Student Service, formerly CFR (Committee on Friendly Relations Among Foreign Students).

of the political, economic, and social problems of Latin America.

What are the causes which make students emigrate?

1. Rapidly increasing numbers of university students in the past few years. The opportunities offered in remedy of the situation do not increase apace with the rapid student population increase which is approximately 2.8 percent each year.
2. The need for more universities and colleges.
3. Wider and more specialized fields of study in present universities are demanded.
4. Party politics on the campus and in the university atmosphere is also a contributing factor.

What I have just mentioned could be applied to foreign students in general.

1. What the foreign student needs is *understanding*: that is, to realize that those he is in contact with are capable of comprehending his religious, cultural, social, and political background. This understanding should come primarily from those connected more intimately with the student's life—fellow students, college and university teachers, families and citizen groups engaged in foreign student work.
2. Opportunities to communicate intelligently, in or out of the classroom, must be available for foreign students.
 - a) The foreign student is terribly inquisitive. He has a personal background and personal characteristics which he has to reshape in the new environment.
 - b) The student needs living experience to overcome whatever goes through his mind, i.e., prejudices, misinformation, and vague images of the United States.
 - c) The foreign student needs a thorough orientation course on the customs of the United States and on the environment and requirements both academic and non-academic of the institution in which the student is enrolled.
 - d) The foreign student needs advice in organizing his curriculum and in preparing suitable extracurricular activities.

But I have stated that the foreign student wants to be educated in this country. So what he needs is an environment in which he can develop his intellectual and human capabilities to the fullest degree possible.

1. It is necessary to foster in the student the stimulus for academic excellence. The student should be able to satisfy his noble intellectual ambitions.
2. Equally important is making the foreign student aware of the value of his knowledge in terms of social commitments when he returns to his homeland.
3. Finally, he should also be shown how to preserve and how to increase his faith in a highly institutionalized and technological society.

The foreign student has the seed of being a leader within him, mainly if he realizes that he is able to fulfill his desires in a foreign country where he has overcome more abundant and more difficult obstacles. Therefore, he feels deserving of certain "privileges."

1. He would like to be welcomed to the campus with warmth and sympathy as a "cultural ambassador." He feels that he is part of a cultural bridge which communicates his homeland with the United States.
2. He wants to be regarded as an individual. The personal approach is the most effective way of pursuing this goal.
3. Finally, he wants recognition for what he is.

The Community and the Foreign Student

THOMAS QUIGLEY

National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.

I HOPE THE WORD community in the title "The Community and the Foreign Student," is for you an equivocal term. It will be for me in the few thoughts I want to share with you this morning.

If, however, you have some acquaintance with foreign student programs "community" will conjure up a host of images all quite uniform, homogeneous, and unequivocal—a host of images projecting the host image.

Community in that sense usually identifies one of the components of the international education picture, a segment numerically well represented in the lists but typically thought of as an auxiliary; one might almost say, as the ladies' auxiliary.

Community in that sense means home hospitality, Thanksgiving dinner, a trip to a factory, a host family, clubwomen pouring tea at a reception.

Community in that sense is, often necessarily, the surrogate for the whole community; that is, the "community volunteer." *Community* in that sense is, perhaps regrettably often, still further delimited—*community* equals the hostess.

To suggest that this is not or should not be the whole picture is not to derogate the role of the community volunteer or the hostess. It is rather in the hope of seeing that role enhanced and made more meaningful that the observations I wish to offer this morning are directed.

As further background, permit me to sketch in briefly the role of the community in this all-too-usual restricted sense. Permit me also to acknowledge that however accurate, if simplified, a view it may be of many practitioners of community programs for foreign students, it cannot do justice to the more imaginative and progressive thinking of the leadership of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. In the Community Section as well as among the professional foreign student adviser core of NAFSA, this kind of thinking has been advanced through NAFSA by such men as Dr. James M. Davis.

The community (read "community volunteer") is called upon, in the classic view, to provide services and hospitality. The nation is seen as a "host" vis-à-vis the "guest" students and visitors, and the characteristic traits of open-heartedness, generosity, friendliness, charity, patriotism, and even a new form of noblesse oblige are invoked to motivate and mobilize a cadre of several thousand community volunteers to receive and assist our foreign guests.

To receive and assist—hospitality and service.

Why hospitality? Because, again classically, that's the kind of people we

are; because it's somehow in the national interest; because we want to show others what we're really like; and, of course, because the students and visitors themselves (at least substantial numbers of them) are really lonely at times, really do want to observe family life, community activity and organization, and so on.

Why services? For the same reasons, and also because these services correspond to specific needs and wants of various groupings of visitors: ports of entry service, help with housing, and a variety of other, usually supplemental, aids with languages, part-time or summer employment, family services, travel, and the like.

Thus, the role of the community, according to some, is important but peripheral.

One danger of this view is that it tends to be static, regarding the community's role as relatively fixed, simple and well-defined—a constant. Change is allowed for only in the number of people involved and in the quality of services performed. The performer, however, is not seen as changing and thus not truly involved. He is outside the real action which presumably is carried on between the student and his university. Custodial engineers are important to ensure the presence of chairs and light in the classrooms; community volunteers are important to ensure certain beneficial extracurricular experiences.

This is too simple and categorical. And it is so for the simple reason that it ignores what is really happening in education and in the world today. The world and the universities are in a new stage of development. They are in a state of international development which transcends so many of the old pieties and which defies so many of the old categories that it demands examination.

More than we have in the past permitted ourselves to realize, we as Americans are a developing people. America is an unfinished experience requiring for its continued development the same kind of interplay between currents from within and from without that an earlier day witnessed with its admixture of frontier, enlightenment, immigration, and the rest. We can put it even more dramatically by quoting the president of the University of Rochester. He said:

America's consciousness of the world must undergo the same transformation that occurred in Western Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as a result of the great voyage of discovery. . . . To a degree we do not yet recognize, with an unparalleled speed, we are discovering a new world. Our educational habits and practices have of necessity been deeply influenced by Western Europe. . . yet there simply must be room in general education . . . for the opportunity to bring into focus the new world . . . (*The University and World Affairs*, p. 11: Ford Foundation.)

The university preeminently, but the total community no less truly, are essential actors in the drama of international education—the font of international development. But if interdependence, mutual assistance, reciprocity, and intercultural collaboration are ever to be more than polysyllabic platform statements for large numbers of our otherwise alert citizens (and our students), the universities must be better pedagogues in international education than they are now. It is the international dimension which, if not totally

missing in our institutions, community and university, is highly underdeveloped.

Ironically, the international dimension, in its fullest, interrelated, integrating, and dynamic sense, is all too often missing in community programs for foreign students; just as, with equal irony, it is largely undeveloped in the foreign student program itself in many universities. In the Higbee Report, the author asserts that a majority of foreign student advisers ". . . still view the *foreign student program* as one comprised of social and community activities and certain special administration services." (Homer D. Higbee, *The Status of Foreign Student Advising*, p. 47. Lansing: Michigan State University.)

In the report, Higbee goes on to say:

From the relative handful of exceptions to this generalization flows almost all of the imaginative, broad-range thinking about the role of the foreign student in the United States institutions of higher education. This small group tends to view the foreign student as a positive educational resource and relates the institution's commitment to the foreign student to the institution's broader commitment to international education. (*Ibid.*, p. 47.)

In the still more rarefied circles of presidents and other academic officials, Higbee found relatively little thinking about the universities' role in international education. Even the universities which are most active in projects abroad and which enroll a number of foreign students ". . . tend in general to view their participation in projects abroad as related primarily to national foreign policy. They likewise view their foreign students as a disconnected fragment of their institutional life and do not relate the foreign students to permanent institutional interests in international education" (*Ibid.*, p. 44). Higbee concludes: "Without a philosophy of international education at an institution, the foreign student program lacks an adequate base."

Is this any less applicable to the community? Without a dynamic of international exchange and development, without an expanding world view, community programs for foreign students lack an adequate base. And how can the community acquire this needed base, this philosophy of international education, except from those whose profession commits them to it?

One of the big steps towards this has already been taken by any college or university enrolling foreign students and actively encouraging community involvement in this *de facto* international community of scholars. The fact of foreign students, their presence in ever-increasing numbers on our campuses and thus in our communities is the great *donne* in this drama—the plus factor that makes attainment of our international education goals incomparably more possible. They are in the words of Ford Foundation's Melvin Fox, ". . . the vital artery of academic interchange." They are the best means for tying together the international education effort and establishing the channels essential for world communication and eventual understanding.

But just as there is no alchemy working for us in the university, there is none either in the community. The university has not finished its job by admitting a foreign student, nor has the community its job by serving up a hot meal.

What can the university do to assist the community in making its involvement with foreign students something of still greater value? A report

by the Committee on the University and World Affairs is willing only to say "... special efforts should be undertaken, going considerably beyond what is implied by 'hospitality,' to give [foreign students] an acceptable and satisfying place in student and community life." (*The University and World Affairs*, p. 30.)

In an earlier section of the report, however, we read:

Universities bear a responsibility in world affairs, as in other fields, to open the perspectives of scholarship to other institutions and to individuals in their communities. There is need for wider cooperation in this field between universities and colleges and secondary schools. In universities where there are continuing education programs, these should take adequate account of the fact that world affairs have become of decisive importance to all citizens. (*Ibid*, p. 29.)

I would take from these two statements, as key phrases, "special efforts ... going beyond hospitality" and "open the perspectives." I would rephrase it by suggesting that the university must think out and work out new imaginative means whereby it can bring the larger community to an awareness of its own internationality, and that it quite consciously seek to "open the perspectives" of all its students, foreign and domestic, and of the community around them. Furthermore, I would hope that the university will seek to so internationalize the campus that all coming into contact with it—parents, alumni, precollege students, continuing education students, business, cultural and professional associations, and, yes, the ladies pouring tea at the Thursday afternoon receptions for foreign students—will see that this international dimension is not an extra but, if I may use the word, an "intra," something that is for us almost a condition of our being—a condition that derives from our very nature as members of the human family, responsible for and dependent upon one another; a condition that achieves its perfection in our nature as members of the laos, the people of God, and that finds today its most complete and meaningful expression of all time in the unique circumstances in which the Lord of History has placed us. One of those circumstances for which we have not yet shown sufficient gratitude is the foreign student in our university and in our community.

English and the Foreign Student

ROBERT LADO

Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

THE FOREIGN STUDENT's proficiency in English is a decisive factor in his success in the United States. Therefore, it is important that we find out what his level of proficiency is through *testing his command of English*, and that provision be made for teaching him English when necessary.

THE PROBLEM: ENGLISH IS A DECISIVE FACTOR

Compare the United States student with the foreign student. The United States student is carefully selected as a freshman on the basis of his high

school record, recommendations, and CEEB scores. He is familiar with the environment, including an idea of what is expected of him in college. He is a good reader, at a speed between 200 and 400 words per minute and has no language handicap since English is his language.

The foreign student, on the other hand, is selected less systematically and he does not take to CEEB's, nor should he, according to the CEEB itself, because of heavy cultural and language factors. He is thoroughly uninformed and confused with regard to U.S. culture and college life including such matters as food, speed of activities, boy-girl social life, dress, courtesy. He is a slow reader at a speed between 40 and 140 words per minute or about 6 to 20 pages an hour. He has a language handicap—English is a foreign medium of expression and he does not use it with the flexibility and ease of his native tongue. Furthermore, when he arrives he is homesick, is probably suffering from food upset, has a rest-pattern deficit, and must give conscious thought and attention to every detail of his waking day, since his habits and knowledge are not adjusted to his new environment.

The reading handicap alone can be understood by the following case. The history teacher assigns 50 pages for home reading. The U.S. students do it in one to two hours; the foreign student takes eight hours.

The language handicap means that he does not understand things as clearly, and what is less known, he does not remember as well what he has heard. Experiments show that memory retention in a second language is less effective than in the first.

Finally, while the U.S. student is memorizing the facts of the history lesson, the foreign student is learning to pronounce and spell Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania.

TESTING ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

To determine the foreign student's proficiency in English, there is a new program known as TOEFL (Testing of English as a Foreign Language). This program, operating with a grant from the Ford Foundation, is sponsored by a national council of interested institutions and associations such as the IIE, NAFSA, CAL, and ACE, and is associated with the Center for Applied Linguistics of the Modern Language Association of America.

This program prepares a three-hour test battery of English proficiency for foreign students including auditory comprehension, grammatical structure, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing. The battery is administered abroad by the Educational Testing Service at a cost of \$10.00 per student. This entitles the student to have his scores sent to three colleges of his choice. Additional reports are sent at a cost of \$1.00 each.

The first administration of the test took place in February, 1964, and a second one is scheduled for November of the same year. The test will then be offered three times a year, probably in February, May, and October.

Applications for admission to the test should be made to TOEFL, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey. Information on the program itself can be obtained by writing to TOEFL, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

For testing students at times other than those scheduled for TOEFL, there is an individual service provided by the Testing and Certification Division, English Language Institute, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. This service will test the proficiency of a student by contacting the student

and the nearest examiner in his country. The examination results, including an interview rating, are forwarded to the college or university requested. The charge is \$10.00 per student. This program has been in operation since 1955.

Other tests are described in the *Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook* edited by Oscar Buros. These have to be administered by the users.

The information provided by these tests permit a more rational planning of the student's stay in the United States. If his control of English is fully satisfactory, he can plan to enroll in regular course work along with U.S. students. If, however, he shows any significant language handicap, provision should be made for overcoming it instead of letting the student fail with all the unhappiness and extra complications that such an outcome entails for the student and the academic institution admitting him.

Provision for English instruction can be made in the student's own country in binational and other centers or in intensive courses in the United States.

TEACHING ENGLISH

Intensive courses of varying duration are available at U.S. colleges and universities, particularly during the summer months. These courses provide 15 to 35 hours of instruction and lab practice a week for foreign students. The Center for Applied Linguistics of the Modern Language Association (1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036) publishes a list of these Programs in English for Foreign Students. The list for the summer of 1964 includes thirty institutions in fifteen states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Other institutions listed restrict enrollment to their own students.

Georgetown University, the University of Michigan, Columbia University, New York University, St. Michael's College, and others continue these intensive courses during the academic year.

Good as the work of these courses might be, there is still a period of adjustment and improvement in English for the foreign student when he goes on to his regular academic work. The ordinary freshman course, which the foreign student might have to take to fulfill graduation requirements, is ill adapted to his needs. Some institutions, including Georgetown University and the University of Michigan, have special sections of Freshman English with experienced instructors.

Concurrent courses in English as a foreign language are also offered by many institutions for their foreign students when they are already carrying some of their regular courses.

I would advise colleges that do not have enough foreign students to make such formal provisions for them as providing tutors from among upper classmen who will guide the foreign visitors through the incredibly difficult problems of studying in the United States.

College and University Department: Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting

Atlantic City, New Jersey, March 31, 1964

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the College and University Department of the National Catholic Educational Association met in the Music Room of the Chalfonte Hotel, in Atlantic City, N.J., on Tuesday, March 31, 1964. The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, president of the Department, asked Bishop Dougherty to say the opening prayer.

Present: Bishop Dougherty, Sister M. Augustine, Father Britt, Dr. Conley, Father Dore, Father Dunne, Father Dupont, Father Egan, Sister M. Eugene, Sister M. Jean Frances, Brother Gregory, Dr. Hart, Msgr. Haun, Msgr. Horrigan, Sister M. Josetta, Father Kelley, Father Klekotka, Sister M. Lorraine, Sister M. Louise, Dr. McCoy, Sister Joan Marie, Dr. Matre, Father Meyer, Father O'Connor, Father Oetgen, Brother Potamian, Father Reinert, Msgr. Shannon, Brother Bonaventure Thomas, and Father Walsh.

Absent: Sister Anastasia Maria, Father Casassa, Father Desautels, Father Hangartner, Mother M. Humiliata, Dr. Nuese, Sister Rosemary, and Father Waldschmidt. The Secretary had been informed that Dr. Betz, Sister M. Concetta, Father Hogan and Father Sullivan would be unable to attend.

Minutes of January Meeting. The minutes of the meeting held in Washington on January 13, 1964, were approved, with one correction, as circulated by mail from the Secretary's office. The correction requested by Father O'Connor was concerned with the fourth sentence of page 5, indicating that the American Council on Education "had expressed itself as opposed to earlier forms of tax-credit" legislation. Father O'Connor denied that the American Council had taken this position and said that the minutes should properly read that the Council had taken "no position" on tax-credit plans. The Secretary indicated that this correction would appear and be distributed via the minutes of the March meeting.

Committee Reports. Dr. Raymond McCoy, chairman of the Committee on Graduate Study, reported that there had been no meeting of his committee since the Executive Committee had met in January and that there was nothing further to communicate at this time. He outlined the program that was scheduled for Wednesday afternoon, April 1, under the sponsorship of the Committee on Graduate Study. Dr. McCoy also announced the publication of the recently distributed list of graduates of Catholic graduate schools. He indicated that he was not certain of its value since very little reaction was received. He hoped that the members of the Executive Committee would pursue this in their respective institutions and possibly communicate to him the relative importance of the list of those students receiving graduate degrees in Catholic colleges and universities.

Since the Committee on Graduate Study had originated the request concerning the conferring of honorary degrees that had been the subject of the Executive Committee's concern at the last meeting in January, Monsignor Horrigan reported on subsequent action of NCEA on the proposal on honorary degrees. Monsignor Horrigan indicated that Archbishop Cody had promised him that

he would attempt further clarification in Rome. (There is a further discussion of this in the minutes of the second Executive Committee meeting held on Thursday, April 2, which is attached to these minutes.)

Father Klekotka was then called upon for the report of the Finance Committee. Father presented the budgets of the various Regions, the *Newsletter*, and the Secretary. Dr. Hart and he had analyzed them and recommended that the budgets be approved as submitted. It was indicated that the budgets represented no increase in outlay for 1964-65. Father Britt seconded Father Klekotka's motion and the budgets were approved unanimously. They were given to Monsignor Horrigan for presentation at the meeting of the General Executive Board.

Election of Editor of Newsletter. On motion of Father O'Connor, seconded by Sister Augustine, the Executive Committee unanimously approved the re-election of Sister Mary Lorraine as editor of the *Newsletter* for the coming year. Following this, Sister Mary Lorraine gave a report, in which she thanked the members of the Department for supporting her efforts and indicated the possibility that due to the press of other duties she might not be able to continue as editor beyond 1965.

Report of the Associate Secretary. Father Dunne was called upon to report on the activities of the Washington office. He began by discussing the requested support for the study of the Inter-Institutional Organization of American Higher Education that had been requested by the Association of American Colleges and was presented to the Executive Committee at its January meeting. Father Dunne hoped that the Department might express its interest in the project and pledge its support. In the discussion that followed, there was unanimous agreement that the support of the Executive Committee should be given to the projected study. The reason for the delay and apparent misunderstanding was attributed solely to the fact that the proposal from the AAC had not been thoroughly reviewed by the Executive Committee due to the bad timing of its last two meetings. All the members of the Department expressed regret that any misunderstanding might have occurred, and it was moved by Monsignor Shannon and seconded by Father Kelley that the Executive Committee of the College and University Department unanimously endorse the proposed study of the Inter-Institutional Organization of American Higher Education, which had been proposed by the Association of American Colleges, and agree to cooperate with it. This was approved without dissent.

Father Dunne's report continued. He suggested the necessity of keeping our Congressmen informed of our own hopes for appropriations with regard to the recently passed Academic Facilities bill. He pointed out that there were some in Washington who did not believe that colleges were as anxious for these appropriations as they really are. If the present Congress does not vote an appropriation for the current fiscal year, it will mean millions of dollars lost forever for college and university construction.

The question of tax credits came up as the discussion continued. The members of the Executive Committee had heard Commissioner Keppel indicate his lack of enthusiasm for this form of financing in the general meeting that had preceded the meeting of the Executive Committee. Father Dunne believed that there was greater support in Congress for the extension of NDEA, the Hartke bill, and other educational measures than there was for tax credit; this despite Senator Ribicoff's enthusiasm for the tax measure. The discussion of the attitude of the College and University Department toward tax credits continued from

various viewpoints. Fathers Britt and Reinert agreed that perhaps there wasn't as much support for the tax-credit measure as had been originally thought at the time of the close vote in the Senate. Sister Eugene, Monsignor Shannon, Father Dunne, Monsignor Horrigan, Monsignor Haun, Dr. Conley, and others participated in the extended discussion. The question seemed to be whether the Department should continue to support the principle of tax credit despite certain cautions that had been given. Many believed that while it was true that there was serious need for federal funds to support higher education for those who could not afford college without it, nevertheless the burdens that fell upon large numbers of Catholic middle-income families in paying tuition on all levels while supporting the public schools was a matter of concern to all present. The question of prudence seemed to be the paramount issue. If a successful battle for tax credit was waged, the colleges and universities would continue to hope for federal funds for academic facilities. Yet one could possibly destroy or minimize the other. While no action was taken, the Executive Committee agreed that this question should be carefully studied, and expressed gratitude to Father Dunne for keeping it abreast of these problems, and hoped that he would continue to inform the Department on the best course of action to be taken.

The Responsibility of American Catholic Higher Education in Meeting National Needs. Under the heading of new business, Father Kelley and Monsignor Shannon suggested that the Executive Committee take immediate steps to implement the excellent paper given by Father Reinert at the General Session earlier in the afternoon. The need for an overall policy for the expansion, development, and improvement of American Catholic colleges and universities was a problem that they felt called for rapid action. Bishop Dougherty suggested that a subcommittee be appointed to work out a program for presentation to the bishops. Father Klekotka agreed and suggested that an NCEA subcommittee and a subcommittee of the bishops might best work together on the solution of the problems indicated in Father Reinert's challenging paper.

Monsignor Horrigan pointed out that other papers were going to be given on Wednesday that might have further bearing on this question and promised that there would be a full discussion of the entire question at the next meeting of the Executive Committee scheduled for Thursday morning, April 2.

Following this the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD A. MATRE

Secretary

Minutes, Executive Committee, April 2, 1964

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the College and University Department met in the Music Room of the Chalfonte Hotel in Atlantic City on Thursday, April 2, 1964. The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, president of the Department, asked Monsignor Haun to say the opening prayer.

Present: Sister M. Augustine, Father Britt, Dr. Conley, Father Dore, Father Dunne, Father Dupont, Father Egan, Sister M. Eugene, Sister M. Jean Frances, Brother Gregory, Dr. Hart, Msgr. Haun, Msgr. Horrigan, Sister M. Josetta, Father Kelley, Father Klekotka, Sister M. Lorraine, Sister M. Louise, Dr. McCoy, Sister Joan Marie, Dr. Matre, Father Meyer, Father Oetgen,

Brother Potamian, Father Reinert, Msgr. Shannon, and Brother Bonaventure Thomas.

Absent: Sister Anastasia Maria, Father Casassa, Father Desautels, Father Hangartner, Mother M. Humiliata, Dr. Nuesse, Sister Rosemary, and Father Waldschmidt. The Secretary had been informed that Dr. Betz, Sister M. Concetta, Bishop Dougherty, Father Hogan, Father O'Connor, Father Sullivan, and Father Walsh would be unable to attend.

Further Consideration of Honorary Degree Problem. Monsignor Horrigan opened the meeting by reporting on a conference with Archbishop Cody in which the subject of the required clearance for the awarding of honorary degrees had been discussed. A further discussion was placed on the agenda for the next meeting, following study of the matter.

Continuation of Discussion on the Founding of New Colleges. The greater part of the rest of the Executive Committee meeting was given over to the discussion of the problem that seriously concerns Catholic higher education posed by the founding of additional colleges with limited resources and little hope of development or accreditation. It was pointed out that the Department has been seriously concerned with this problem for several years; that a subcommittee had been formed to work with the Conference of Major Religious Superiors; that four important resolutions had been submitted by this subcommittee, headed by Monsignor Shannon, and approved unanimously at a Department meeting last year. Father Reinert's paper given two days before this meeting had brought the entire problem out into the open and had caused substantial reaction and, if preliminary indications were correct, almost unanimous support for his position on the "needless proliferation of smaller colleges." In the discussion that continued, several members of the Executive Committee indicated the problems that face bishops and religious superiors who are required to provide education in areas remote from existing colleges and universities. There seemed to be a consensus that the College and University Department was the place to which they could turn for assistance. There were some who believed that the actions of the subcommittee and the resolutions of the Department had not evoked much response in important segments of the Catholic higher education scene. Others, on the contrary, believed that the problem had been so well publicized within the family that few would contemplate the establishment of a new college without careful consideration of resources.

Several members of the Executive Committee wished to have it clearly understood that they were not opposed to all expansion of either existing colleges and universities or of new ones. They believed that the Executive Committee of the College and University Department, through its Committee on Membership and with the help of its Associate Secretary, could provide blueprints for carefully planned expansion. Various proposals were made to implement what had been done and to move up rapidly on this problem as Father Reinert had outlined it in his paper. Father Reinert, himself, indicated a tentative program for action. In essence, he suggested that some type of document called "Guidelines in the Development of Catholic Education on Catholic and Secular Campuses" be prepared. This would not be a detailed blueprint but rather a general proposal for the future. In order to do this, he suggested that funds be acquired, possibly through grant sources, to set up an office with a full-time person and a secretary to prepare a preliminary "Guidelines." He believed that with this done the Department could go to a foundation for continued support, and that out of this could be prepared a significant statement

indicating a philosophy of Catholic higher education, a geographic or demographic study of its status, some indication of its present and future needs, the position of junior colleges, adult education, and the like. Father believed that out of this, possibly, could be prepared several case books. Without attempting to press final titles on these he suggested: "Guidelines for Bishops in the Expansion of Catholic Higher Education," "Guidelines for Major Religious Superiors." Father Reinert indicated that these would not be sets of rules and regulations but rather the skeletal outlines of where to go from here. He believed that once all of this was done it would require a steering committee composed of representatives from colleges and universities, elementary schools, Newman Federation people, Catholic laity, and possibly some membership from secular institutions. The whole project would possibly take something like two years to complete.

This proposal led to a prolonged discussion, and all present indicated their support for the idea if not for some of the specific details suggested. Father Dunne indicated that a letter had been sent to all major religious superiors indicating the problems of starting new colleges. This letter had been sent out through Father Dunne's office and had been prepared by Dr. Selden of the National Commission on Accrediting. Father Dupont agreed with Father Reinert's suggested program but cautioned lest it confuse the situation by having the Catholic University of America operate a program of affiliation while the NCEA was "doing the same thing." He suggested, too, possibly the problem could be solved by changing the criterion for Associate Membership in the College and University Department. He stated that he would be willing to meet and work with those connected with Catholic University's affiliation program for the provision of new and stronger procedures.

Sister Augustine explained the function of Sister Mary Rose Dominic who had been assigned by the Sister Formation movement to meet with any religious superiors contemplating the founding of a new college. She suggested more direct contact with the Conference of Major Superiors at their coming regional meetings. Sister Joesetta, the Executive Secretary of the Conference of Major Superiors, endorsed Sister Augustine's position and hoped that a representative from the Executive Committee could be present at the coming August meeting in order to provide information on this subject and to listen to the problems that some of the superiors faced.

Various other positions were explained. Many agreed with Father Dupont's statement that it was a fallacy to believe that it would be less expensive to found a college than to send students from religious orders away to existing colleges. Father Kelley agreed with Father Dunne that perhaps the requirements for Associate Membership should be revised so that the colleges who did not meet certain strengthened criteria might not be admitted as Associate Members of NCEA. It was reiterated that despite excellent cooperation between the College and University Department and the Catholic University, through Miss Rita Watrin, the myth that affiliation is in some ways equal to accreditation was still prevalent in some parts of the country.

The discussion of reviewing the standards for Associate Membership in the Department was continued with Monsignor Haun indicating that, although he was chairman of the original committee which drew up the standards, he now believes that it is time to make changes. Father Dupont stated that the new regulations, of course, would not be retroactive; that existing institutions would continue in their position of membership, but that new criteria might prove helpful for future admission. A moratorium on admission was suggested.

Dr. Conley suggested that periodic examination of Associate Members be instituted.

Although the discussion continued for some time, Monsignor Horrigan finally tried to summarize the problem by pointing out the many areas of agreement in several of the proposals made. He suggested that Father Dupont might well, with the Committee on Membership, review the requirements for Associate Members and report back to the Executive Committee at its next meeting. Monsignor Horrigan indicated, however, that Father Reinert's proposal was much broader than a review of the membership requirements. He suggested that the traditional midsummer planning meeting might be expanded to consider Father Reinert's proposal in detail. Father Reinert indicated agreement and said that he would be willing to draw up a more complete proposal for possible presentation at a summer meeting. Following this the Department took several actions:

1. On motion of Father Dore, seconded by Father Dupont, the following resolution was passed unanimously:

We are seriously concerned with the reflection on Catholic education caused by the proliferation of small Catholic colleges that are inadequately staffed and poorly informed of the impossible obligations they are attempting to assume.

2. On motion by Father Britt, and seconded by Sister Josetta, the following motion was passed unanimously:

The College and University Department accepts the offer of Father Reinert to prepare a statement for a summer, 1964, meeting on the question of *Guidelines for the Development of Catholic Higher Education on the Catholic and Secular Campus*.

3. On motion of Father Kelley, seconded by Monsignor Haun, the College and University Department suggested that a moratorium of two years be established in the admission of new Associate Members while this problem is under study.

This motion was passed unanimously.

4. It was moved by Monsignor Shannon, and seconded by Father Britt, that a representative of the Department should be invited to attend (a) the Conference of Major Superiors of Women, (b) the Conference of Major Superiors of Men, and (c) hopefully a meeting of the American Bishops' Committee on Education whenever it should meet. This representative should be prepared to explain the problems outlined in the discussion above.

Following this the meeting was adjourned at 12:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
RICHARD A. MATRE
Secretary

College and University Department: Officers 1964-65

President: Brother Gregory, F.S.C., New York, N. Y.

Vice President: Very Rev. Michael P. Walsh, S.J., Chestnut Hills, Massachusetts

Secretary: Dr. Richard A. Matre, Chicago, Illinois

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, Louisville, Kentucky

Dr. William H. Conley, Bridgeport, Connecticut

Department Executive Committee

Ex officio Members

The President, Vice President, and Secretary

Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri. Vice President General representing College and University Department

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan, Louisville, Kentucky. Department Representative on General Executive Board

Dr. William H. Conley, Bridgeport, Connecticut, Past President and Department Representative on General Executive Board

Dr. Raymond McCoy, Cincinnati, Ohio, Secretary of Committee on Graduate Study

Very Rev. Gerald E. Dupont, S.S.E., Winooski, Vermont, Secretary of Committee on Membership

Sister Mary Lorraine, O.S.F., Winona, Minnesota, Editor, *College Newsletter*

Non-voting Members

Rev. William J. Dunne, S.J., Washington, D.C., Associate Secretary

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Julius W. Haun, Winona, Minnesota

Rev. Cyril F. Meyer, C.M., Jamaica, New York

Brother A. Potamian, F.S.C., New York, N.Y.

Brother Bonaventure Thomas, F.S.C., New York, N.Y.

General Members

Sister M. Augustine, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Very Rev. Laurence V. Britt, S.J., Detroit, Michigan

Dr. James A. Hart, Chicago, Illinois

Rev. Joseph Hogan, C.M., Jamaica, New York

} 1961-65

Very Rev. A. William Crandell, S.J., Spring Hill, Alabama

Very Rev. William F. Kelley, S.J., Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Sister Joan Marie, S.N.J.M., Oakland, California

Very Rev. Brian J. Egan, O.S.B., University Park, Pennsylvania

} 1962-66

Most Rev. John J. Dougherty, South Orange, New Jersey

Sister Mary Josetta, R.S.M., Washington, D.C.

Very Rev. Charles S. Casassa, S.J., Los Angeles, California

Sister Mary Concetta, O.S.U., Louisville, Kentucky

} 1963-67

Sister Anastasia Maria, I.H.M., Immaculata, Pennsylvania

Rt. Rev. Msgr. James P. Shannon, St. Paul, Minnesota

Very Rev. James F. Maguire, S.J., Chicago, Illinois

Rev. V. J. DeLeers, O.Praem., West De Pere, Wisconsin

} 1964-68

Officers 1964-65—Continued*Regional Unit Members*

Very Rev. Michael P. Walsh, S.J., Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts	}	New England
Very Rev. Richard H. Sullivan, C.S.C., North Easton, Massachusetts		
Very Rev. J. A. Klekotka, O.S.A., Villanova, Pennsylvania	}	Eastern
Sister Marie Christine, G.N.S.H., Buffalo, New York		
Sister Mary Eugene, O.P., New Orleans, Louisiana	}	Southern
Very Rev. John A. Oetgen, O.S.B., Belmont, North Carolina		
Rev. Carl A. Hangartner, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri	}	Midwestern
Dr. Siegmund A. E. Betz, Cincinnati, Ohio		
Sister M. Jean Frances, O.P., Edmunds, Washington	}	Northwestern
Very Rev. Paul E. Waldschmidt, C.S.C., Portland, Oregon		
Sister M. William, I.H.M., Los Angeles, California	}	Southwestern
Rev. Herman J. Hauck, S.J., San Francisco, California		

Section on Teacher Education

Chairman: Sister Rosemary, D.C., Emmitsburg, Maryland

Vice Chairman: Rev. E. J. LaMal, O.Praem., West De Pere, Wisconsin

Secretary: Sister Maureen, S.S.N.D., Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Sister Formation Section

Chairman: Rev. Mother Mary Regina, R.S.M., Bethesda, Maryland

Vice Chairman: Rev. Mother Kathryn Marie, C.S.C., Notre Dame, Indiana

Executive Secretary: Sister Annette, C.S.J., Washington, D.C.

Newman Education Section

Chairman: Rev. Richard Butler, O.P., Chicago, Illinois

Vice Chairman: Very Rev. Msgr. Gerard Glynn, St. Louis, Missouri

Secretary: Rev. James T. Healey, New Haven, Connecticut

Education and African Development

THE HONORABLE G. MENNEN WILLIAMS

*Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs
Washington, D.C.*

A DYNAMIC DESIRE to achieve a better life has been set in motion in Africa in this decade of the sixties. The aspirations of millions of Africans to improve their lot cannot be ignored either by African leaders or Free World nations. Africans have declared war on illiteracy, poverty, disease, and other factors that have retarded Africa's development over the years. To most Africans independence means progress, and they expect their leaders to advance their material well-being in a relatively short time.

Our late and beloved President Kennedy recognized the significance of the aspirations of the African peoples and the need to help them attain their goals. In his memorable Inaugural Address, he said:

"To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe, struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we need their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

President Johnson continued this theme in his first State of the Union Message in January, when he asserted:

"We must strengthen the ability of free nations everywhere to develop their independence and raise their standard of living, and thereby frustrate those who prey on poverty and chaos. To do this, the rich must help the poor—and we must do our part."

In Africa, there are many areas where such help is needed. The list of problems the people of that continent face is long. The average per capita income throughout the continent is only \$120 a year—well below the Middle East's average of \$215 and Latin America's \$295. It contrasts even more sharply with our nearly \$3,000-a-year average.

Africans have to overcome such problems as a shortage of investment capital and entrepreneurs, both large and small; a lack of trained technicians and administrators; a serious dearth of industrial facilities.

There is also a high infant mortality rate; a low life expectancy—one out of every five Africans dies before reaching puberty. There are massive problems of malnutrition and disease; too few doctors, nurses, and medical facilities.

Although most Africans are farmers, the average farmer can produce only about 4 percent as much as his North American counterpart. Africa—the second largest land mass—accounts for only 5 percent of the world's agricultural production.

There is a serious shortage of people who know how to repair and maintain equipment of various kinds—automobiles, trucks, refrigerators, heavy-duty road equipment. And often there are no parts available for maintenance work. As a result, such items have a very short life-span.

And, then, there is education. Only some 15 percent of the people can read and write, and only about 40 percent of African school-age children are attending primary school. This is very low compared with our literacy rate of more than 95 percent, and 99 percent of our children are in primary schools.

It comes as no surprise, then, that many Africans—perhaps to a greater degree than Americans—look upon education as the key to the future. Enlarged educational opportunities and expanded educational facilities, in the African view, are fundamental to economic and social progress. I can agree that education is a vital part of nation-building.

Five years ago, when I was Governor of Michigan and principally concerned with the affairs of one American state, I said, "Education is the seed of American growth and the root of American opportunities." Today, when I am concerned with matters in some thirty-five independent African nations and a dozen or more still-dependent territories, I would apply the same statement to Africa. Although the circumstances are vastly different, the basic principle applies in both cases.

The relationship between education and growth has been detailed in recent years by the studies of Professor Theodore W. Shultz of the University of Chicago, who writes that "the most universal limiting factor in achieving economic growth is ignorance." Noting that the size, composition, and capabilities of the labor force is a "stock" in the same sense that land, plants, and equipment are stocks, Professor Schultz points out that the stock represented by education in the United States labor force increased $8\frac{1}{2}$ times between 1900 and 1957, compared with an increase of $4\frac{1}{2}$ times in the stock of reproducible nonhuman wealth in the same period. Thus, he concludes, "investments in education may explain a large part of the otherwise unexplained economic growth of the United States." It is clear that the human being and his capacity to educate himself and acquire new skills has been the principal factor in the great advances in productivity this country has made in the past half century.

Studies relating education to economic growth in less-developed nations are not voluminous, but Angus Maddison of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development has found that "there is considerable evidence that investment in education [in underdeveloped countries] has a high pay-off in terms of accelerating economic growth, and it is certainly true that countries which have a record of rapid economic development, such as Japan and U.S.S.R., have made heavy educational investments."

This idea also is put forth in the work of Frederick Harbison of Princeton, who, together with Charles A. Myers of M.I.T., studied education and growth in seventy-five countries. Professor Harbison asserts: "There is a strong correlation between a country's educational development and its economic productivity . . . The best single indicator of a country's wealth in human resources is the proportion of its young people enrolled in secondary schools."

In general, enthusiasm for education is at least as high among Africans as it is among any people in the world, although the efforts of the various African countries to improve education are somewhat uneven. This, however, is in part due to the nature of the different educational heritages left by the former colonial powers. Nevertheless, such countries as Nigeria and Ghana are putting

as high a percentage of their national budget into education as are any other parts of the world. In fiscal year 1963, for example, Nigeria allocated 19.4 percent of its budget to education, and Ghana 18 percent. And Nigeria's Western Region last year allocated 43.4 percent of its budget to education. It is clear that education is a matter of prime and pressing importance to Africans.

African leaders are increasingly aware of the importance of well-conceived and effectively administered systems of education to the social and economic growth of their countries. The rising expectations of their people demand that African governments provide more educational opportunities to permit individual advancement. They also realize that national cohesion, another essential factor in economic growth, can be achieved more readily through increased education for their people.

These leaders are recognizing, however, that "education for education's sake" is not the total answer to their needs. They seem aware that economic advances, social progress and stability can come about more rapidly through a greater emphasis than in the past on training in agricultural and industrial arts and sciences. They need large numbers of skilled men and women to meet the technical requirements of their developing economies and polities, and many leaders are beginning to orient their educational programs in that direction.

We have seen how effective this concept of liberal and applied education has been on our own history. To take just three examples: The Morrill Act of 1862 inaugurated our invaluable system of land-grant colleges; the G.I. bill of World War II had a profound effect on the shape of postwar America, and the free, two-year community college would appear to be our next major educational adaptation to the needs of the times. A similar process is taking place in Africa, where there is considerable recognition that the traditional classical curriculum is not the total answer to Africa's educational needs.

This is a complex task, however, and there is some reluctance among youth to embark upon technical and vocational education. For example, the largely agricultural character of the African economy led W. Arthur Lewis, the distinguished specialist from the University College of the West Indies who is now at Princeton, to suggest that at least 50 percent of Africa's young people should be trained for agriculture. But, as Professor Lewis points out, comparatively few African youths will develop an interest in a career in agriculture until that area of economic development is made more attractive.

Solutions to such problems are receiving the careful attention and study of African leaders, and some progress is being made. African ministers of Education have held a series of conferences, the most recent of which closed only last week at Abidjan, Ivory Coast, at which they have designated what they consider priority matter in the African educational field.

The initial efforts of this group were made at Addis Ababa in 1961. That conference agreed upon the basic concepts: that educational planning must be made a part of each nation's total economic progress; that the development of human resources is an essential component of economic and social growth; and that firm priorities must be established and stern criteria applied before substantial money grants and loans would be made to African states by international programs, donor states, and private foundations.

The three most important priorities to emerge at Addis Ababa were: the need to remove bottlenecks at secondary school levels; the need to revise and expand school curricula, particularly in agricultural and technical education; and the need for trained teachers at all levels. American efforts—both

governmental and private—have been aimed at helping to alleviate these priority problems.

Some 22 percent of our total A.I.D. program in Africa is devoted to education, and the bulk of this effort is directed toward secondary education. This includes teacher-training projects, new classroom facilities, and agricultural, technical, and vocational education. Teacher-supply programs comprise a significant part of this effort.

The Peace Corps is playing a most important role in African education. Of the 2,200-plus Peace Corps volunteers in Africa, more than 1,700 are teachers, of whom the majority are in secondary schools. In Ghana, for example, where Peace Corps Volunteers are teaching mathematics, science, and French, those teachers comprise 50 percent of the secondary school teachers with university degrees. Our volunteers also help students in such extracurricular activities as athletics, drama, and art.

One part of our educational effort in Ethiopia is a major program in which the Peace Corps and A.I.D. are cooperating with the Ethiopian government to improve elementary and secondary education in that country. In this program the Peace Corps has provided 336 secondary school teachers who instruct in a broad range of subjects; A.I.D. has provided technicians, equipment, textbooks, and other educational materials; and the Ethiopian government has allocated 20 percent of its budget to the building of classrooms and the payment of teachers' salaries. A.I.D. also has helped to develop an agricultural education, research, and extension program in Ethiopia and is assisting with the development of Haile Selassie I University.

The combined efforts of American private agencies have contributed a sum well in excess of \$20 million to help relieve the bottleneck in African secondary school education. These efforts are led by the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and the Rockefeller Foundation, but a number of smaller organizations are also very active in the field.

The pioneering efforts of missionaries in elementary and secondary education represent an important contribution to African progress by the private sector of our country. In cooperation with local government administrations, missionary schools in Africa have brought the gift of education to many of the more remote communities of the continent. In my travels, I have visited a number of such schools, and I am well aware of the valuable work they are doing to help developing nations move ahead. Their influence has touched many African leaders, including some at the very top. As a matter of fact, some 20 of Africa's 35 Chiefs of State or Governments received at least part of their education in either Catholic or Protestant mission schools. Christian missionaries have done much to cement good relations between Africa and the West.

Americans at home also have an opportunity to play a role in the great drama of Africa that is now unfolding on the world stage. You who guide six million young Americans have a special responsibility to prepare them for a world in which Africa will play an increasingly important role. Some of you, I am sure, already are placing emphasis on Africa in your curricula. This is an encouraging development, and I hope the practice becomes even more widespread.

There is an urgent need to develop a broad knowledge and understanding of Africa, its people and their way of life—of African leaders, their struggles for freedom, and their governments—of the continent, its wildlife, its minerals,

its lands and waters—of Africa's music and dance, its painting, sculpture, and literature.

The special relationship we have with Africa—a relationship growing out of the fact that some 20 million of our fellow citizens have some African heritage—should give us even more reason for pursuing knowledge of that great continent. There can be little question that there is a strong link between the rise of newly independent states in Africa and the intensification of the struggle for civil rights in this country. If, therefore, we can learn more about the American character through the study of Africa, the more intelligently we will be able to deal with some of the problems we face at home today.

Sometimes it seems much easier to understand the importance of education in a distant and underdeveloped country than it does to understand its importance in the United States. Nevertheless, we have serious problems of our own that should not be overlooked. For example, 30 percent of our students drop out of classes before completing high school, and another 62 percent who graduate from high school do not go on to college. Although figures are inexact on how many of these students are Negroes, I think it can be assumed that Negroes comprise a sizable segment of dropouts. This is reflected in the fact that nearly 10 percent of all whites 14 years of age and over complete one to three years of college, while less than 5 percent of nonwhites in the same age-bracket complete that much higher education. Among all races, a large percentage of high school dropouts and graduates who do not go to college are forced to withdraw for financial reasons and for reasons other than scholastic inability. This constitutes an irreparable loss in a country that is short of people with many of the higher skills, such as teachers, doctors, scientists, and engineers. In this respect, I am reminded of Professor Alfred North Whitehead's statement that "the race which does not value intelligence is doomed."

Africa has a long way to go to realize its full potential, but the stakes are high and the goals are worth the effort. We want to see a strong and free Africa develop in peace and stability. If we—you and I—through our daily work can assist in Africa's development and in helping to bring about a better understanding of that continent, it is likely that the children whom you guide today—and their children—will be able to live in greater peace and harmony than does our generation. Our concern with the important remedial needed in this country also will contribute to that objective. I think this is a goal all of us share.

• Resolutions

Be it known by all present that:

WHEREAS, The Department of School Superintendents, National Catholic Educational Association, met a felt need in 1957 by the creation of the position of Associate Secretary with an office in Washington, D.C.; and,

WHEREAS, During this period of seven years, the office has eminently proved its worth through programs and plans which have evolved from it for

the collective and individual professional growth of Diocesan Superintendents of the United States; and

WHEREAS, These pioneer endeavors were due in the main to the initiative and energy of the first Associate Secretary who has occupied the office uninterruptedly up to now; and

WHEREAS, The Most Reverend Ordinary of this proto-Associate Secretary has seen fit to promote him to the rank of pastor in the Diocese of Marquette; and

WHEREAS, The Diocesan Superintendents of the United States regard this gain to the Diocese of Marquette as a loss to their Department;

Be it resolved, That the Diocesan Superintendents, assembled in plenary session at Atlantic City, express to Monsignor O'Neil C. D'Amour their profound appreciation for his notable services during the past seven years; and

Be it further resolved, That they extend to Monsignor D'Amour their best wishes and the assurance of their prayers for a full measure of success in all his future endeavors.

Atlantic City
April 2, 1964

REV. WILLIAM M. ROCHE, *Chairman*
VERY REV. MSGR. JAMES C. DONOHUE, *Secretary*
REV. EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.
RT. REV. MSGR. HENRY C. BEZOU
RT. REV. MSGR. EDWARD T. HUGHES

• Associate Secretary's Remarks at Superintendents Meeting, April 2, 1964

IT IS MUCH DEBATED whether men shape events or events, men. Whatever the outcome of this debate might be, I do know that the political accident that seven years ago thrust me into the national office placed me amidst forces that have done much to shape my life. I only would hope that in some small way I have succeeded in modifying these same forces for the future. I wish to say tonight that to have served you, and through you the schools and the youth of this nation, has been a deep privilege for me.

As I close out my term of office, I would ask you to bear with me for a moment. Over these seven years, I have refrained from intruding upon you, holding myself rather to the simple reporting of facts. At this moment, I trust that you will indulge me as I attempt, perhaps with some amount of sentimentality, to express in words certain feelings that mean much to me. I suppose what I shall say might be called a kind of credo—a credo that I brought with me to this office and that has been expanded and strengthened in the years that I have worked with you.

I am passionately convinced, some have said too passionately, that the Catholic school system—born to protect a minority under seige, nourished by the loyal devotion of the people, built on the unselfish dedication of religious men and women—under Divine Providence represents the hope and the promise for the future of our faith and of our country.

I believe that this Catholic school system preserves for the people the philosophic traditions upon which the founding fathers erected our institu-

tions—the traditions of a world having an order beyond relativity, a world resting upon natural law, a world founded upon the reality of the spiritual, a world of a personal God and of men possessing dignity as His children. I believe that these traditions must find existence not only in the minds of philosophers, but they must serve to undergird and inform the schooling of young citizens in elementary and secondary education. I believe that it is the Catholic school system that provides for this nation the means of preserving its philosophic traditions.

I believe that the Catholic school system has been, and is, a good school system, with all that these words connote. I believe that, today, amidst the cries of alarm, this system stands on the very brink of a new greatness. I believe that the attaining of this greatness, the fulfillment of the promise, depends primarily on what you, the diocesan superintendents of schools, choose to do. I believe the system can advance only if you bring to bear a maximum of leadership so that the chains of undue parochialism might be broken and the inhibiting barriers of diocesan lines overcome; so that the wealth of our resources might be utilized, resources human and temporal; so that the forces of intelligence, of imagination, and of love might be freed for the shaping of the future; so that a framework might be built within which our dedicated teachers, religious and lay might work most effectively.

This I believe: The future of our faith and our country rests in the Catholic schools. And this I believe: The future of the Catholic schools rests with you. I pray that God may grant you the strength and the vision to fulfill this destiny.

I wish to thank all of you for your patience and cooperation. In particular, I wish to thank the presidents under whom I have served—Monsignor Carl Ryan, Monsignor Henry Hald, Monsignor Henry Bezou, Monsignor Bennett Applegate. Finally, I must express a sincere "thank you" to the one who has been the architect of the NCEA, one to whom we all owe an unpayable debt of gratitude, Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt.

O'NEIL C. D'AMOUR

Atlantic City
April 2, 1964

• MEETING OF CATHOLIC LAY PEOPLE

THE MEETING for Catholic lay people again this year proved a veritable mine for background information on the current struggle for proper recognition of Catholic schools by all American citizens. Mr. Ball's presentation gives an excellent summary of the current status of Federal Aid and the Catholic school. Mr. O'Loane's talk¹ should become a classic, in that it is the most complete summation of the history of relations between governmental authority and private education that has ever been attempted.

The School Superintendents Department respectfully requests the Executive

¹ "Religious Schools and Public Authority—An Historical Summary," by J. Kenneth O'Loane, Diocesan Steering Committee, Diocese of Rochester, N.Y., will be issued as a separate pamphlet by the NCEA in the fall, 1964.

Board of the NCEA to permit it to sponsor another such meeting for Catholic lay people at the 1965 Convention in New York City. In addition, suggestions for increasing potential lay delegates from various dioceses will be most happily received.

REV. WILLIAM M. ROCHE
Chairman, Meeting of Catholic Laymen

Federal Aid—1964

WILLIAM B. BALL

*Executive Director and General Counsel, Pennsylvania
Catholic Welfare Committee, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania*

SO FAR AS church-related schools are concerned, the federal aid picture has been changing since 1961—but in some ways it has remained very much the same. It is the same in the sense that the Administration program to include elementary and secondary education in federal aid has not yet passed. It is the same in the sense that Catholic education does not yet participate in such aid. It is the same in the sense that the Catholic position on federal aid is still not well understood by the public. And it is the same in the sense that this position is also not well understood by Catholics.

Perhaps we should take that position as our starting point. It really has four essential features:

1. That no determination was expressed as to whether the federal government should enter the education field with major financing (as opposed to the principle that states and localities should bear almost solely the financial burden).
2. That aid should be provided church-related education only upon a contingency—namely, that major federal aid to education generally would be enacted.
3. That the aid should be partial, rather than total—that is, that aid should be limited to secular objectives achieved in church-related schools and should not support the complete endeavor of church-related schools.
4. That the form by which such aid may be extended was not specified and could conceivably take one or more of a variety of different forms.

One may ask: Why have these positions of the Church been misunderstood? I suppose that it is principally due to the fact, still with us, that there have been too few knowledgeable and articulate Catholics who have bothered to learn precisely what the stand taken by the Church officially really is. (Of course, we should recognize that there are knowledgeable and articulate Catholics who disagree with one or more aspects of that position.)

If a fair amount of misunderstanding exists at the present, perhaps more will result from certain issues which are very lately being raised more and more in the federal aid debate. Already, one can observe that the voices of Catholics on these issues are even more indistinct.

The first of these newer issues is the so-called "permeation" question. This question simply asks: Are there any really "secular" courses in a church-related school (especially in a Catholic school)? Just a little over a year ago, you will recall, Professor George LaNoue brought forth his rather celebrated studies of Catholic textbooks and curricula in which he attempted to demonstrate that religion was so thoroughly mixed into the so-called "secular" subjects that it could scarcely be said that anything really "secular" was being taught in Catholic schools. From this, of course, flowed a Constitutional implication: Any governmental aid to that sort of education would be a direct support of religion and unconstitutional. Now, Professor LaNoue has been answered very ably by some Catholic spokesmen. Some other Catholics have, however, only muddled the waters further by unthinking answers which they have given to the LaNoue argument. Some have said: "We can permeate all we want—that's our right!" That, of course, does not answer Professor LaNoue's question, because it leaves hanging in the air the further question of whether, if we "permeate" up to the hilt, we are then entitled to governmental aid.

There are really three matters which need to be mentioned in the face of the "permeation" argument: First, it should be pointed out that LaNoue's examples from textbooks were highly arbitrary and not representative. Secondly, Catholic educators, always interested in excellence, should not be found endorsing silly and unwarranted intrusions of religious matter into secular subjects. I have been told that the fault, in the case of some of the religiously overdone textbooks, belongs squarely on the heads of some publishers who sought to exploit the idealism of some of our Catholic teachers by throwing together textbooks "tailored for the Catholic schools," in which religious elements were introduced jarringly, needlessly, and downright foolishly. Catholic educators, however, as a whole, do not favor textbooks in which dabs of spurious religion serve only to distort the essential subject matter and to rob the teaching of that subject matter of its integrity. Thirdly, the real test, wherever government aid is in the picture, is whether the secular subject is faithfully taught. Therefore, if in an arithmetic book certain references of a religious nature appear, the only proper question which may be raised respecting governmental support of that course, is whether the full content of the arithmetic is offered the pupil, based upon reasonable comparisons of that *arithmetic* content in a parallel public school course.

The second new problem is that of "proliferation." The question raised about proliferation goes something like this: If Catholic education is to participate in federal aid, will it accept that aid and improve the institutions which it has, or will it use that aid not to improve its existing program and institutions but solely to create more schools in order to catch up with the Catholic pupil population not presently in them? This question, as you can see, rests in part upon an assumption that Catholic schools generally today suffer from inferiority. This assumption is most certainly not true. Nevertheless, it would seem reasonable that federal aid to education would be granted under certain conditions relating to quality. These conditions, however, would have to be realistic as well as fair. On the score of realism, however, the Congress would have to keep in mind all that has been said these past four years respecting an "education crisis." We would not be resolving that crisis, for example, by creating artificially high standards. Creating school buildings modeled on the U.N. Headquarters, with auditoriums

acoustically engineered to accommodate the Philadelphia Orchestra, will not necessarily free America to take the league-long steps she needs to take in order to overcome today's educational deficiencies.

Thirdly, there are questions raised respecting many other kinds of aid than federal aid. In many states at the present time Catholics are pushing, variously, for school buses, free textbooks, sales tax exemptions for school textbooks, school subsidies, and what not. This, too, creates confusion. Many of these drives are good and necessary, but it is only natural that some citizens and legislators should ask what it is that Catholics really want. I do not think that Catholic education, or the Church, should be required to set down some sort of "final plan" to which it is irrevocably committed and by which it is completely limited, for the future. Yet, if it were possible to accomplish, I should think that some better definition of aims, with respect to all forms of governmental aid, would be desirable. Perhaps that is asking too much. At least, however, we could clear up some of the confusion by, for example, not using such terms as "parity" of treatment. This at once gives the impression that we desire our total operation to be governmentally subsidized. And you will at once recall the prominent point in the official Catholic position, to the effect that we do not seek to have the religious aspects of Catholic education governmentally supported.

Fourth, a peculiarly legal question has cropped up, namely, judicial review. We are being asked, in other words, whether we will be willing to have a court test provided for in any federal aid bill which includes us. Superficially, this sounds like fair play. If we are so sure that aid to Catholic education would be lawful, why should we not welcome a court test of such constitutionality—and why should not such a test be written into any bill conferring such aid? There are at least two reasons why we should oppose any court test provision. First, this places a sort of yellow badge upon the bill, marking this bill out as having a peculiar infirmity. Second, and far more important, by such a provision, the Congress would discard its responsibility to determine the constitutionality of legislation which it is enacting. Again, it would be a wholly bizarre thing to single out appropriations bills in the area of church-related education for the special provision of a court test.

Lastly, in the new problems, we find the great question of a definition of "religion" in the First Amendment. This is a problem which a great number of persons have been refusing to focus upon. Over the decades the Court has evolved a very broad definition of religion to mean almost any sort of belief. This has great relevance, of course, to all of the problems respecting governmental aid to religion, or to schools in which "religion" is offered. We cannot escape the fact that the Court has specifically designated Secular Humanism as a religion. I do not think that the believers of God in this country will long tolerate any situation in which a secular humanistic value system may be promoted in the public schools but the slightest inculcation of theistic religion must be considered prohibited.

I have mentioned all of these considerations merely in order to explain to you how complex the federal aid picture is. May I now briefly mention to you a number of very marked changes which have taken place in the federal aid picture, showing a rather marked increase in support of the Catholic position.

In the field of public opinion, there are numerous evidences of change for the good. You are familiar with the favorable change reflected in the

Gallup poll. A number of outstanding leaders in American thought have publicly expressed sympathy with the idea of including church-related schools in federal aid—among these Walter Lippman, Robert Maynard Hutchins, and others. Today, there is scarcely a constitutional scholar of standing in the country who has not publicly stated that he believes the inclusion of church-related education would be constitutional. Then we have seen the magnificent statements of Senator Ribicoff, as well as the fact that the NEA, at its convention last year, for the first time in its history dropped the “public schools only” clause from its resolution on federal aid. I should add that our legal case (in spite of all that I had to say at the beginning of these remarks concerning misunderstanding) has also made considerable headway in the form of public opinion.

This increase of favorable public opinion, we must note, has entailed some other effects. For one thing, it has helped to rivet attention on the Catholic schools. Not for years have there been seen so many nationally published articles and comments on the Catholic schools. Much of this attention has been devoted to weaknesses which the writers have asserted exist in Catholic education. Another effect has been an undeniable growth of the spirit of statism—and of a rather militant sort—upon the part of those who fear a growth of “the Catholic power” in the United States. The intensity of the discussion of the possible role of church-related schools in federal aid has moved many of these people to forsake any idea whatsoever of founding or supporting their own church-related schools and to join in a rather frenzied crusade to give public education a monopoly on education in the United States.

These trends, pressures, and attitudes are having other effects. One immensely beneficial effect is the spurring, among Catholic educators, of an in-depth examination of Catholic education. The teaching of religion is beginning to get a thorough going over. And we can think of many more examples. That is certainly healthful. Again, Catholics are starting, for the first time, to look at public education, to compare it critically with Catholic education—and out of this is coming a clear picture of weaknesses and strengths in both.

Also, we should mention—as a most beneficial effect of these pressures—that Catholic education is experiencing a far greater consciousness of *the meaning of citizenship in a religiously and racially pluralistic society*. Many an old isolationist attitude is on its way out, and distinctively American conceptions of human freedom (totally consonant with Church teachings) are flowing in. Of course, this is also in part a reflection of Vatican II.

Lastly, in looking at effects of the federal aid controversy, we should note that the very fact of its intensity and continuance has helped promote the *federal aid principle* (some will say that this is not necessarily a blessing).

On the legislative front, three developments need to be noted: (1) The Academic Facilities Construction Act (which includes church-related institutions). (2) The Administration's Anti-Poverty Bill. (Beware of attempts to broaden its educational provisions into a grant highway to which major federal aid will be rerouted!). (3) The attempts to amend the Constitution to provide for prayers and Bible-reading in the public schools (an unwise move).

On the litigational front, problems abound. We are apparently in for more test cases. The effort will be continually made, in the months and years to come, to haul into court every sort of governmental accommodation to religion, and all of these efforts will have relevance to federal aid, if church-

related education becomes included in federal aid. It seems, however, our unfortunate habit that we wait for blows rather than take steps in advance to defend against them.

These remarks of mine raise in your minds, I suppose, the question of what you can do. The basis of any action upon your part, of course, is love of God and zeal for His Church. But it is important for you really to focus on the implications of the shortage of religious vocations now a fact in our country. This should spur you into a decision that you are going to step in and work hard for Catholic education in all areas in which it is possible for a lay person to work—and they are many. You need, therefore, to study Catholic education and its problems. You need, also, to see it in a larger context of education generally, of public law, and of the nation and the Church generally.

Here I should recall to you the fact that we presently have two poles of opinion on the subject of Catholic education. One view strongly reacts to the "ghettoism" which it believes the Catholic school to stand for. It believes that Catholic education is an effort to project protective concepts, necessary to nineteenth century conditions, into the mid-twentieth century where they are not relevant. It regards the separate Catholic school as a divisive force in the community. But it sees that separation mainly as damming up Christianity in our society. These Catholics believe that Catholics should be fully present in, thoroughly integrated into our society. They look to a liberation of Christianity through the elimination of the social separateness of its schools. They do not fear loss of faith through contact with others; they expect a spread of faith through contact with others. Their plea is for "maturity," as opposed to what they conceive to be a stultifying protectionism. And they believe that this maturity will be achieved through home and altar—especially through radically Christian parents who will afford a better religious education for the child than what these critics regard as the notably weak training in religion now imparted in Catholic schools.

If these critics are in the minority, dwindling in numbers also are their fellow Catholics at the opposite pole. These say (or infer) that Catholic education as it is today is unimprovable and must at all cost be preserved as it is. They react furiously to criticism of it. Mary Perkins Ryan provokes in them not answers, but hysteria. These so-called supporters of Catholic education seek militantly to exempt it from all state regulation and, in fact, to exclude it from as much relationship to government as possible—except when it comes to getting governmental benefits for it. They manifest an air of rather bitter isolation from "the world" and they are anti-public school in attitude.

A very large third group exists, however. It likes the idea of a pluralism of schools, and it fears governmental monopoly of education. But it is democratic in spirit, and it by no means believes that only in a state-run system of schools is it possible to rear citizens for life in a democracy. This middle group is zealous for improvement and rejects the Catholic stand-patter as strongly as it rejects the Catholic critic who would liquidate the Catholic schools. They are busy experimenting with new methods for teaching religion. They are for quality, for excellence. And they believe quite emphatically that Catholic schools have not only rendered glorious service to American society in the past but are capable of making an even greater contribution in the future.

How Catholic Schools Look to Parents: What the Public Should Know

MRS. CHARLES J. O'NEIL

Home and School Service, National Catholic Welfare Conference

THE GENERAL THEME of this panel is "The Public Image of Catholic Schools." It is my particular responsibility to direct my remarks to the subtitle, "How Catholic Schools Look to Parents: What the Public Wants to Know." We might also consider together the question of, "What Can a Well-Informed Catholic Laity Do To Present a True and Proper Perspective on the Role and Place of the Catholic Schools in America as Well as on Their Successes and Failures, Their Problems and Experiences?"

It seems suitable, therefore, to state at the beginning that the public image of the Catholic school should represent the truth of the school—its purposes, its work, its problems and difficulties, its successes and failures. This image should not be an artfully contrived or artificially created one, in order to become a hidden persuader, nor should it suggest either the hard sell or the soft sell. What should be attempted is an honest appraisal of the Catholic schools in 1964. This means that we need facts and information rather than statements of feeling. It means that we must be careful neither to over-generalize nor to oversimplify. The fact is there is no Catholic school system in the United States; there are Catholic schools; there are some diocesan school systems; some religious communities of nuns have a system since they have elementary, secondary, and collegiate schools. There is as much diversity among Catholic schools as there is among public schools. It might be well to add here that there is no single public school system in the United States. The schools, public and nonpublic—and these two categories cover all schools—are regulated by the laws of the fifty states. Catholic schools must abide by certain specific state regulations just as much as public schools; and to that extent they may be categorized as "public."

The problems of the Catholic schools are, in part at least, the problems of American society. It is not just enough to direct our attention to the Catholic schools, because we are really speaking of education in 1964 in our Republic. Here, for the first time in the history of mankind, a society is attempting to provide a basic education for all its citizens—even more, an extended educational opportunity for all its citizens—and concomitant with that and parallel to it have been the endeavors of the Catholic people—laity, religious sisters and brothers, clergy, religious priests, and bishops—extending backward to the earliest colonial times, to retain and enlarge on the religious content of schooling and education which to millions of people is part of their birthright. Even more, to millions of people, education without religion is not only not education, but it is a perversion of education.

None of the problems of contemporary education, Catholic or otherwise, can be solved by appeals to a long-gone age, or to other systems in other lands now or in the past; nor just to successes in the past. Our attention

must be centered on the second half of the twentieth century. For these reasons I pass over quickly, with just a mention, the directives of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore; the general extension of the educational age; compulsory school attendance; the changes in the religious orientation of the public schools; the dedication of the Catholic sisterhoods of America with their consequent subsidy to Catholic education; tax exemption; certification of teachers; the general increase in population; the extension of knowledge itself; the ever-growing and demonstrated need for adequate schooling to meet personal and familial economic needs; the conclusive evidence of the relationship between poverty and lack of education; and, of course, the needs of the Nation itself for an educated people, not only for defense and survival, but for an educated people whose leisure time pursuits will reflect the meaning and character of America. And—lest at this moment we might overlook one salient feature for Catholics—the necessity for religious orientation and instruction in a comprehensive and orderly fashion which we believe can be achieved best in religious schools. To speak thusly of the schools is to give a very broad general summary of various factors, developments, and demands that pertain to the history of education, of which the Catholic schools have been a notable part, and to which they have contributed greatly. Millions of people have been educated in the Catholic elementary and secondary schools and have taken a proper place in our society.

What is the factual situation of our schools? By 1965 it is expected that one-half the population will be twenty-five years of age or under. This means something less than approximately one hundred million people needing some kind of schooling. In 1962-63, \$32 billion, or 7 percent of the national income, was spent on education for an estimated total enrollment from kindergarten through degree-granting institutions of 51.5 million students. Fifty-eight percent of the population between the ages of five through thirty-four years was enrolled in some type of school. In March, 1962, the level of education of Americans twenty-five years of age or over was 11.4 grades while in 1940 it had been 8.4 grades. This gives you some basis for judging the extent of the general educational endeavor. In 1963, 71 percent of those students who entered ninth grade four years earlier were in the twelfth grade, indicating that about 29 percent had dropped out somewhere during the high school years.

To concentrate on elementary and secondary schools, \$19.5 billion was spent on *public* schools and \$3.3 billion on *nonpublic* schools. About 80 percent of these latter are Catholic schools. To concentrate momentarily on the secondary schools: the nonpublic secondary schools, representing 8.5 percent of all secondary enrollment, graduated 12.4 percent of all graduates in 1960. Of these nonpublic secondary schools, in all the states but one, Catholic schools enroll over half the secondary students attending church-related schools. There are 2,523 Catholic high schools, and they are located mostly around the larger urban areas: New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Detroit and St. Louis. With respect to the teacher-pupil ratio, the Roman Catholic schools have a greater number of pupils per teacher. Many of these same facts pertain equally to elementary parochial schools located in large urban areas. The annual cost of educating the 5½ million students in Catholic schools at current per pupil costs would be about \$2 billion.

With respect to the public schools—to which, incidentally, the students now in nonpublic schools would have to go if gradually these nonpublic

schools were closed—there was an excess of 1,659,000 students over school capacity; 409,000 students were on half-time classes in thirty-five states and the District of Columbia. Sixty-one percent of these students were in elementary schools, and only half of this number are included in the excess capacity figure of 1,659,000. There were 31,700 school districts among the public schools of the fifty states of varying sizes, administered by an equal number of school boards selected in almost every conceivable manner, e.g., election, appointment by various means, and with extraordinary swings in variation as to the education and ability of the school board members. It is well to keep in mind some of these problems of the public schools as we discuss and view the Catholic schools. In some areas there are superior public schools; in others not. Schools even vary greatly within school districts, not to mention the great variation within states. I might add that there are 83,000 teachers who failed to meet state certification requirements, and two-thirds of these were in the elementary schools.

No matter how we try, the inescapable facts of education and schooling in twentieth-century America require more money, more time and effort, better teacher preparation, more individual attention to students and their problems, more improved methods of instruction; also better means to persuade students to finish their education; more cooperation between school administrators, teachers, parents, and citizens; improved school boards—of all kinds.

In view of all these problems, at this point let us momentarily direct our attention to the unusual circumstance of the recent beatification of Bishop Neuman and Mother Seton, both of whom were so intimately associated with the establishment and development of Catholic schools. It occurs to me that perhaps their examples should give stronger faith and hope, as well as prudence and justice, to whatever efforts Catholics are called upon to make. At the moment there are two studies in process on the Catholic schools. Undoubtedly we will have more precise information when they are concluded.

Why do Catholics maintain schools in which are now taught about 5½ million children in the 13,000 elementary and secondary schools? There has been a 127 percent increase in the Catholic school population since 1942. The increase in the elementary school population has been consistent until this year when it rose only 1 percent. There are 123,422 religious teachers and 67,535 lay teachers—an increase of 400 percent between 1942 and the present. The increase in the number of lay teachers is one of the most striking facets and factors in Catholic education. (It is, of course, one reason for the increased cost of instruction. However, it might be added here that as lay teachers had to be paid more adequate salaries, so, too, did the sisters begin to receive a more adequate salary. It is at this point that I feel compelled to say that in justice—not to mention charity—the Catholic schools of the United States at the elementary and secondary levels have been subsidized for more than 100 years by the sisters. From personal experiences I know something of the financial operations of some religious communities, and the penurious, token sums of money that they have been paid in the past continues to shock me.) This whole question of adequate compensation for religious teachers as well as for lay teachers is one of the “big” problems confronting Catholic education. Parents are clamoring for more schools. It is not enough to cite the canon law to explain this although in itself it is sufficient reason for Catholic schools. For the record,

however, I shall take a few minutes to refresh our memory on the canon law.

No. 1113: "Parents are bound by a most grave obligation to provide to the best of their ability for the religious and moral as well as for the physical and civil education of their children, and for their temporal well-being."

No. 1372: "From childhood all the faithful must be so educated that not only are they taught nothing contrary to faith and morals, but that religious and moral training take the chief place."

No. 1373: "In every elementary school religious instruction adapted to the age of the children, must be given."

No. 1374: "Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic, neutral, or mixed schools. . . . It is for the Bishop of the place alone to decide, according to the instructions of the Apostolic See, in what circumstances and with what precautions attendance at such schools may be tolerated without danger or perversion to the pupils."

No. 1375: "The Church has the right to establish schools of every grade, not only elementary schools but also high schools and colleges."

Why are parents clamoring for Catholic schools? Surely, there must be something in the image of the Catholic school that appeals to parents. From the preliminary report of the Notre Dame Study there were thirty-one things parents expect of Catholic schools. Foremost among these are religious training of the child, firm discipline, academic and social development. It is interesting to note, also, that 20 percent of the 24,000 parents' questionnaires resulted in volunteer comments beyond the answer requested and some were several pages in length. Nine out of ten of these unsolicited comments were "favorable."

The Catholic schools cannot guarantee the salvation of souls, nor do they claim to do so. On the other hand, Catholics believe that a general education without religion is not a general education. The religious instruction which is a part of the curriculum of the Catholic school serves a dual purpose: it is an intellectual discipline and subject with its own content; and, secondly, it places the teaching of religious doctrine on an equally important plateau with other subjects in the curriculum. Neglect of doctrine is not merely neutral; it is regressive. Furthermore, while attendance at Catholic schools does not guarantee salvation or faith, the environment or milieu of the Catholic school serves to provide an atmosphere of Christian influence in which the operations of God's grace and the virtue of faith—both of which are mysteries not possibly controlled by natural circumstances—will have the opportunity to deepen and develop. These are no small reasons for the establishment, maintenance, and support of the Catholic schools. Furthermore, and happily in our Republic, these schools are the efflorescence and acknowledgment of the religious liberty of the American people. They are a symbol of a democratic society. If for no other reason, they should be maintained. Thus, we have a few reflections on the image of the Catholic school as it appears to parents.

It is important to indicate at this juncture that the personnel of the Catholic schools—teachers, supervisors, superintendents, or bishops—do not claim

that the sole source of religious instruction in doctrine is the school. Religious instruction begins with life itself and continues till death by way of family, Church, the Mass, sacraments, Scriptures, sermons, religious exercises, liturgical practices, prayer, and reading. The school is only one part of the religious training of the young. To give high place to the school as part of the educational framework is not to deny to the Church its role as the means of salvation; nor to deny to the parents their duties and rights as the educators of their children.

We have tried to give some facts of the current educational picture with emphasis on the Catholic schools. We have conveyed something of the image that a majority of parents have of these schools. Let us look for a moment at several descriptions of images that others have of these schools.

What image or idea do people, Catholic and non-Catholic, have of the Catholic schools? We do have some testimony to an assortment of images. First, from a layman in Brooklyn, New York (*Commonweal*, letter June 23, 1961):

... My own experience of twelve years of second-rate, shoestring Catholic education was a most unhappy one; the almost universal lack of funds available to Catholic schools indicates that my experience was not unique; the negligible contribution of Catholic school graduates to the intellectual life of our nation demonstrates that the Catholic system has failed. If the first duty of a school is to its students, the loss of the joy of creativity and productivity in the lives of so many thousands of students must stand as a severe indictment of the system.

Father Denis Geaney, O.S.A., writing in *Catholic Reporter* (reported in *Commonweal*, January 31, 1964):

There is nothing sacred about the Catholic school system in the United States. The system is not of divine origin. On the contrary, it is a response to the Protestant-oriented culture. It is the product of the genius of the great episcopal minds of the past century and the generosity and hard work of the priests and laity. . . .

Martin Mayer, the distinguished writer on education, *Commonweal*, January 31, 1964 said:

By and large, though our evidence will continue to be scanty until Father Hesburgh and Dr. Shuster publish their report, the Catholic schools seem to be a depressed area in American education. By whatever objective measurements we can name, they rank well below the public schools of their areas. Less money is spent per pupil, class sizes are substantially larger, there are fewer teachers per thousand pupils, and the teachers themselves are typically less well prepared (which is saying a good deal) . . . though there are good diocesan school systems, and excellent parochial schools, the average level seems considerably lower than it should be. In my rather limited observation, the level of Catholic education seems lower than the level of public education, allowing for all of the bumps up and down from average in both categories.

(To add a comment at this point of Mr. Mayer's remarks, he does not adduce any specific evidence to support his general conclusion.)

A very interesting comment is that of Justice Jackson in a dissenting

opinion in the famous *Everson Bus Case* decision, 1947. Justice Jackson has this to say about his view of Catholic schools:

It is no exaggeration to say that the whole historic conflict in temporal policy between the Catholic Church and non-Catholics comes to a focus in their respective school policies. The Roman Catholic Church, counseled by experience in many ages and many lands with all sorts and conditions of men, takes what, from the viewpoint of its own progress and success of its mission, is a wise estimate of the importance of religion to education. It does not leave the individual to pick up religion by chance. It relies on early and indelible indoctrination in the faith and order of the Church by the word and example of persons consecrated to the task.

Our public school, if not a product of Protestantism, at least is more consistent with it than with the Catholic culture and scheme of values. It is a relatively recent development, dating from about 1840. It is organized on the premise that secular education can be isolated from all religious teaching so that the school can inculcate all needed temporal knowledge and also maintain a strict and lofty neutrality as to religion. The assumption is that after the individual has been instructed in world wisdom, he will be better fitted to choose his religion. Whether such a disjunction is possible, and if possible whether it is wise, are questions I need not try to answer.

I should be surprised if any Catholic would deny that the parochial school is a vital, if not the most vital, part of the Roman Catholic Church. If put to the choice, that venerable institution, I should expect, would forego its whole service for mature persons before it would give up education of the young, and it would be a wise choice. Its growth and cohesion, discipline and loyalty, spring from its schools. Catholic education is the rock on which the whole structure rests, and to render tax aid to its Church school is indistinguishable to me from rendering the same aid to the Church itself.

(The preeminent position in which Justice Jackson places the parochial school, whether one would go quite as far as he does, is certainly an interesting one.)

That parents are mightily desirous of Catholic education is evident from experience, but in the words of Father Neil McCluskey we have the problem put succinctly: "To begin with, the demand by parents for Catholic education for their youngsters has not slackened in the least. A spot check taken of eight diocesan school systems in the summer of 1963 revealed that principals had been forced to turn away some 37,000 applicants—19,000 for elementary and 18,000 for secondary grades." To add to this we have further information from the study being made at Notre Dame University that, in 1962 alone, about 188,000 students were turned away from Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

To conclude with a statement from Father Joseph Fichter, S.J., published in *Critic*, February-March, 1963: ". . . It is assumed that priests are forcing reluctant parents to send their children to the Catholic elementary school. The facts, of course, are quite the opposite. Catholic parents are clamoring for more parochial schools, and are demanding that the pastor build more school rooms. What little scientific evidence we have points to the conclusion that parents consider the parochial elementary school more important than the Catholic high school and college. It shows also that parents prefer the parochial to the public and private elementary school."

And finally, probably the single most accurate and comprehensive statement I have read on Catholic parochial schools, and one which from my experience and knowledge seems to fit the picture best is a paragraph from Father Fichter. "It ought to be pointed out that the parochial school system does not represent a complete and settled policy among the clergy and hierarchy. Some bishops put great stress on the building and maintenance of elementary schools; others prefer to put their diocesan resources into other apostolic ventures. Statistics in the Catholic Directory reveal the uneven position of parochial schools from one diocese to another." (Page 15, *Critic*, cited above.)

At present, the Catholic schools in varying degrees are attempting improvement all along the line of the educational enterprise. Improvement of salaries has already been mentioned. The Sister Formation movement has added greatly to the move to give longer and more adequate teacher preparation. Various dioceses conduct their own in-service training programs; many religious communities do the same. The in-service training programs are conducted for all teachers, lay and religious. Many Catholic dioceses are offering scholarships for teacher education upon the promise of specified number of years of teaching in Catholic schools. Some Catholic women's colleges are beginning programs to help older women return to teaching or to prepare for teaching. This is one area of education that has not been sufficiently explored and opens vistas of great assistance.

Experimentation in new methods of content and of staff utilization are being employed in some schools. The Archdiocese of St. Louis has done extended work in the ungraded primary school. (This ungraded system has been suggested as of great use to avoid high school dropouts.) Great Books programs and special programs for the gifted have been adopted in a few diocesan systems. Extensive use of tests for placement and for comparison with other schools are used by many schools. Educational TV, modern mathematics and language laboratories are all in use in Catholic schools. The elementary and secondary departments of the NCEA publish periodicals alerting their members to new trends, results, and general information on educational developments. This information is designed to be utilized by the local school. The Elementary School Department has set up a Committee on Articulation. These are all mentioned to indicate that the Catholic schools are working hard and long to improve education.

But what now of the future? Especially what of the future with respect to parents and to the laity? What can lay people do, especially those who are not directly concerned either as teachers or administrators of schools? First is the role of the laity in explaining the Catholic school to non-Catholics and Catholics, to the community in which we live. There can be organized campaigns such as that done in Long Island, where regular visitations were made to the homes, and citizens were invited to the Catholic schools. Secondly, there is parent participation in the work and life of the school itself. At the head of the list in this category comes the parent-teacher conference—many, many Catholic schools have these as a regular established part of school life; but many do not. To have parent-teacher conferences is a basic essential for Catholic schools. Thirdly, there is the organized Home and School Association, or PTA as it is called in many Catholic schools. The lack of well-organized, well-motivated, well-programmed Home and School Associations where both parents and teachers are members is the greatest single lack of Catholic schools today; and it is easily

remedied. Home and School groups can actually aid the instructional aspects of the school as well as help with teacher-aid or library-aid programs. They can be supplemental to the work of the school itself. No additional money, building, or personnel is needed for a well-functioning Home and School association; all that is needed is good will and a little work and effort. It is the cheapest and best paying dividend that the Catholic school has at its command at this present moment; and it is the least used.

The movement to have school boards first of all, plus the additional factor of having lay people on the board, is the single greatest hope for the future. Among other effects it helps to dispel the so-called death grip of clerical and hierarchical control. It is also possible that local or parish schools could have their own parish school boards; this is working well in some places. There is no doubt at all that one of the greatest changes from the days of the Council of Baltimore is the concept of diocesan planning and control; and along with that the help that richer and more affluent parishes can give to less advantaged schools and neighborhoods. The shared-time program will continue to make a significant addition to the work of the Catholic school. It is one kind of adjustment to the contemporary world that will have beneficial results beyond our present expectation or anticipation.

Among the more novel suggestions for consideration, the role of the superintendent should be evaluated. Those who are to be superintendents should be selected and trained for this work; they should hold advanced degrees and some of their educational experience should take place in non-Catholic colleges and universities—and this for a variety of reasons. It seems quite feasible that superintendents could be laymen; and that principals could be laymen and/or women. If Catholic men and women are sufficiently trained, educated, and experienced enough to be principals, supervisors, and superintendents in public schools, certainly they can be employed in similar capacities in Catholic schools. The upward grading of the lay person dedicated to Catholic education—and remember there are probably 100,000 right now—is an imperative for Catholic education. There should be degrees from a variety of institutions to give balance and depth to school teaching and administration.

Finally, today we are not assembled to preside over the gradual demise of Catholic schools but rather to see wherein lay people and parents, with fuller understanding, can convey to their Catholic and non-Catholic neighbors the reasons why we need Catholic schools. If we truly believe that religion is important, that we are entitled by right and by constitutional guarantees to freedom of religion, that a single type of school would be disadvantageous to the Republic, then we must be prepared to make some efforts on behalf of the Catholic schools both legislatively and financially; but most of all we must put some personal effort into the educational system itself. With the present resources at our command, more could be done. More knowledge is required, additional information and facts are necessary; but we cannot let the Catholic schools fade away by default.

Perspective on Catholic Education: What the Public Sees and Hears

REV. C. ALBERT KOOB, O.PRAEM.

*Associate Secretary, Secondary School Department,
National Catholic Educational Association, Washington, D.C.*

THERE ARE MANY AND COMPLEX elements involved in the shaping of public opinion. So true is this that agencies concerned with these elements, notably those which deal with the mass media of publications, radio, motion pictures, and television, have long since recognized a need for honesty, ethical standards, and even a certain control both from within their own field and from society at large. In times of stress such as depression, calamity, and warfare, it is extremely important not only that information which molds public opinion be given out with care and consideration, but there must be a proper regard for timing and other factors which might throw the entire picture out of line. Even the most inexperienced newspaper reporter knows that it makes a lot of difference how you write your story and even more difference when the headline is put above it. Indeed, it seems proper to observe that almost any conveying of ideas, news, movements, trends—reporting, that is, in the widest sense of the term—will be colored a good bit by what the author wants to convey and what he wishes others to think. Then, too, emotional bias, no matter how infinitesimal, will no doubt cloud the issue a bit.

When we analyze what the public is hearing about our Catholic schools today we must begin, it seems to me, on such a theme. Much of what is being said today—and I refer to the technical aspects of classroom teaching—has been said at almost every convention for the past thirty years. It was not newsworthy in the forties for the nation had other worries. It was commonplace for convention papers to rant and rave about better preparation for teachers, and such remarks, if they made the papers at all, would be tucked away in the small corners left over when the rest of the news had been laid out.

Let me list a few basic ideas that must guide our thinking today as we hear of “phasing-out” the Catholic schools, dropping grades, shared-time, and all the rest of talk which highlights our difficult going in the Catholic schools:

1. It is terribly wrong to generalize on this matter just as it is to generalize about any large-scale organization. What intelligent person could say “our city governments are run by incompetent people”? The fault is obvious; some are good, others probably are not. Or who can intelligently complain that parents today are too liberal in handling their offspring and expect it to apply to everyone? The category is simply too broad to admit of such sweeping statements. So with schools: some are good, some are not so good.

2. It makes a lot of difference who has assumed the role of critic. Even though a person has spent long years in a particular phase of education, he may be completely unacquainted with the area of education outside his experience. A college professor, for example, especially one who has been surrounded by the ivory-tower atmosphere for a long while, might well be the last person in the world to know what startling new developments there have been in the high school down the street.

3. It is fashionable today to be critical of education. It all started after Sputnik, as I'm sure you know, when America as a whole eased its false conscience, which had long believed that Americans were a super race of sorts, by blaming our schools for allowing the Russians to advance ahead of us in space. Some of the most illogical thinking of many a day was wrapped up in the accusations made against schools and educators. The good effect was, of course, that improvements were made and are being made where real deficiencies existed.

4. It is likewise fashionable today to be a bit self-critical if you are a good Catholic. I say this in the best possible sense. An ecumenical movement has asked us collectively and individually to see where we have been wrong and to right these wrongs. For some Catholics this is hard to take, for their faith, and the training in that faith, hasn't left much room for change of opinion. For others it has meant the door is open, "let's sweep out everything we don't care for."

5. As always, we must be intelligent enough to ask, What is *fact* and what is *opinion*? All startling news is startling because it breaks away from established conditions. But it is essential that the public know accurately what are the true facts. These are not always possible to obtain, much less to publicize. Take, for example, the question of, "How good are our teachers?" And this is asked frequently. We could go on for years trying to ascertain that and still probably miss the true facts.

What I am saying essentially is this: that we have many things to consider about our school system before we can come to accurate judgment concerning its value, its efficiency, its course for the future. Only one who has had broad experience over a long period of time can fully judge the good this system has accomplished and judge the course of action for the future. Certainly, the honest Catholic educator knows the problems of education with all the pressures that American society has placed on schools. America has decided that the school shall supplement the family in many areas of responsibility. While idealistically we may challenge this, the day is not going to come when the parents will again become the prime educator. We may bemoan this, but our Catholic parents for the most part fully subscribe to this, because they are Americans.

I submit for your consideration, then, this idea: that what the public sees today, and what the public hears about the Catholic schools is, for the most part, a very distorted picture of Catholic education. One hates to be pedantic and one ought not to be on the defensive. Yet, at the risk of being both of these, I want to state a few facts that can be backed up by more than ample evidence. And these facts come from the agency that is most likely to know the broad picture of Catholic education, the NCEA. More specifically, these are things that I myself, along with my most capable colleagues, have observed in the past several years as we visited the schools in every state of the Union. I might add, too, that my own work has brought me in contact

with many public schools. I do not, of course, intend to make comparisons favorable or otherwise except to show an accurate picture of what we are accomplishing, but such contact has assisted me in forming some sort of measuring device for our own schools.

I will summarize briefly what I believe to be absolutely necessary information for any Catholic who is concerned about our Catholic school system.

This I know:

1. Our schools have no greater problems than the public schools when it comes to curriculum change. Knowledge is exploding; retraining of teachers is essential; our schools are moving, on the average, about as rapidly as the public school system in the matter of curriculum reform.
2. The so-called shortage of sisters is no shortage at all. Actually, there are more sisters involved with education than ever before. An excellent program for teacher improvement, known as the Sister Formation Movement, has kept increasing numbers from moving into the field as rapidly as we might wish. We are demanding quality and getting it.
3. The quality of teaching in our schools has never been better. Young and enthusiastic teachers are everywhere noticeable, and superiors are encouraging advanced study.
4. On several prominent nationwide studies our high school graduates have fared at least as well as, and frequently better than, the products of other school systems. To be specific: A study done by our office in 1962 showed that 11 percent of all National Merit Scholarship winners came from Catholic schools. Since we represent about 9 percent of the total high school enrollment and pretty much accept all levels of intelligence, this is to be considered an excellent showing.
5. In all five accrediting agencies, the percentage of Catholic high schools accredited is at least as high as the percentage of public schools accredited for that area. In some areas the percentages are higher.

I believe:

1. There is no way to judge how effective we have been in Christian formation. We can compare our Catholicity with that of Europe—and find cause in many cases to rejoice over our Catholic schools. What might have been, what can be done with C.C.D. and excellent home teaching—these are guesses. My guess is that only a system which trains the child in every area of his schooling will give the results we want.
2. We have much need of change in our programs for religious education. This change is coming.
3. We should never think in terms of re-training present teachers for catechetical work exclusively. It can't be done!

Please understand, I make no attempt to minimize our problems. Nor do I wish to denigrate the public school system, which indeed has shown remarkable change in the past five years. We have many hurdles yet to get over—the financial need, the shortage of good administrators, the teacher shortage, the upgrading of methods, content, and technique, and so forth. It is my firm belief, however, that these problems are no worse than they have always been; it simply is true that people in general are looking more

closely at their schools, expecting more of them, and feeling perfectly free to criticize in areas where they themselves have no special competence. These people probably will be with us for a long time. Maybe they will be our greatest blessing in the long run, if they force us to keep pace with our lofty ideals set down at the time of convention each year.

• PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS

School Superintendents Department: Minutes

*Windsor, Ontario, Canada: Annual Meeting
October 21-24, 1963*

THE FIRST SESSION of the 1963 Annual Meeting of the Department of Superintendents of the National Catholic Educational Association opened with prayer at 10 A.M., October 22, at the Assumption University, Windsor, Ontario, Canada. The Rev. Richard Kleiber, president of the Department of Superintendents, presided.

It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the St. Louis meeting be accepted without reading.

Father Kleiber presented Father Joseph Finn, who welcomed the superintendents to Canada. A similar welcome was given by the president of the University.

Tuesday, October 22, 2 P.M.

Panel Discussion: "The Mosaic Pattern of Canadian Catholic Education." The Very Rev. Joseph Finn, Diocesan Director of Education, London, Ontario, served as chairman, and the Most Rev. G. Emmett Carter, D.D., Ph.D., Auxiliary Bishop of London, Ontario, was a very able resource person. The following areas were discussed:

1. "Federal and Provincial (State) Functions Related to Canadian Catholic Education." *Discussant:* Senator John J. Connolly, O.B.E., Q.C., Ph.D., Ottawa, Ontario.
2. "Does State Support of Catholic Schools Mean State Control?" *Discussant:* Mr. C. P. O'Neil, B.A., M.A., Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Education, Toronto, Canada.
3. "How Catholic Educational Rights Fare Before Canadian Superior Courts." *Discussant:* Mr. F. G. Carter, B.A., K.C.S.S., Barrister-at-Law, London, Ontario.

Wednesday, October 23, 9:30 A.M.

Panel Discussion: "The Superintendent and the Religious Teacher." The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Vincent Horkan, Superintendent, Detroit, Michigan, introduced the panelists and the areas of discussion.

"Assigning Religious Teachers," Very Rev. Msgr. James C. Donohue, Superintendent, Baltimore, Maryland. Monsignor Donohue expressed the opinion

that the assignment of religious within a diocese is very important. He recognizes the problems of religious provincials who are faced with two major problems: relationship with pastors and community traditions.

Many of the problems would be solved by a unified effort on the part of the provincials, pastors, and diocesan superintendents. There must be an establishment of standards for teachers, possibly through a national system of accreditation and/or certification for Catholic schools.

Rev. William Roche, Superintendent, Rochester, New York, expressed the principle that every child should get the best education possible regardless of where he lives. This is accomplished when schools have a uniformly qualified staff. This is partially accomplished by establishing a ratio between religious and lay teachers. This ratio must be realistic and periodically revised.

"Orienting the Religious Teacher." The Rt. Rev. Msgr. William McManus, Superintendent, Chicago, Illinois, outlined the basic policies and procedures in developing an orientation program for teachers in Catholic schools. The general orientation program must give a detailed explanation of the philosophy of Catholic education. The teacher must know why she is teaching in a Catholic school. She must have a clear understanding of the Catholic school curriculum and the manner in which religion is related.

Orienting the teacher is the joint responsibility of the religious community, the school principal, and the diocesan superintendent. The major responsibility rests, however, with the diocesan superintendent of schools. Normally, the orientation program is held at the beginning of the school year.

"Contracts for Religious Teachers." The Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate, Superintendent, Columbus, Ohio, reported that less than one-half of the communities who answered the survey had no contract. The obvious advantage of a contract is the protection afforded both to the sisters and the diocese. Lack of flexibility is a common objection to contracts.

The Rev. John J. Leibrecht, Superintendent, St. Louis, Missouri, indicated the general conclusion of the report showed a desire for contracts and an agreement as to its content.

11:30 A.M.—"The Purpose and Function of the National Catholic Guidance Conference." The Very Rev. Msgr. Leo Hammerl, Superintendent, Buffalo, New York, introduced the Rev. George H. Moreau, O.M.I., president, National Catholic Guidance Conference, Buffalo. Father Moreau outlined the history of the conference and its relationship to Catholic education. He further outlined the problems and the development of the conference as it related to the diocesan superintendents of schools. He made the following recommendations:

- 1) A closer liaison between the superintendent and the conference by strengthening the lines of communication;
- 2) Superintendents should recommend and support NCGC at the NCEA Convention;
- 3) Superintendents endorse the philosophy that every school have a program with a trained director;
- 4) That NCGC be called upon to interpret Catholic education and to assist all students—for example, dropouts, college admissions, etc.

2 P.M.—"The Superintendent and Diocesan Boards of Education." The

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Justin A. Driscoll, Superintendent, Dubuque, Iowa; the Very Rev. Msgr. Edward Connaughton, Assistant Superintendent in charge of the Dayton area, Ohio; Rev. Richard Burke, Superintendent, Richmond, Virginia.

The three superintendents, in turn, outlined the structure of the Diocesan Board of Education in their respective dioceses.

3:30 P.M.—“The Superintendent and the Lay Teacher.”

“Recruiting Lay Teachers.” The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Ignatius A. Martin, Superintendent, Lafayette, Louisiana, introduced the panelists: Rev. Louis F. Generes, Assistant Superintendent, New Orleans, Louisiana; Rev. James Deneen, Superintendent, Evansville, Indiana. Fathers Generes and Deneen outlined the recruiting programs of their respective dioceses, and further reported on the questionnaire distributed among the superintendents.

“Hiring and Firing of the Lay Teacher.” The Very Rev. Msgr. John B. McDowell, Superintendent, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, outlined the need for a well-defined policy in the hiring, and particularly in the firing, of lay teachers.

6:30 P.M. Banquet. *Speaker:* THE MOST REVEREND G. EMMETT CARTER, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop of London, Ontario. Bishop Carter outlined the practical implications of the Vatican Council for Catholic schools.

Thursday, October 24, 9:30 A.M.

“Implications of Central Financing.” The Right Rev. Msgr. John T. Foudy, Superintendent of San Francisco, California, introduced the Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, Superintendent, St. Louis, Missouri. Monsignor Curtin outlined many of the implications of central financing and expressed a need for more research. The present method of financing is obsolete and archaic. The financing of Catholic education becomes a total community responsibility. The Catholic Church must accept the principle that all Catholic people support all Catholic schools.

11 A.M.—“A New Approach to High School Construction.” Rev. Aloysius Hasenberg, Associate Superintendent, Marquette, Michigan, introduced Brother Joel Damian, F.S.C., LaSalle Institute, Glencoe, Missouri. Brother Damian presented a new concept in school building—a concept frequently referred to as a “total energy concept.” A temperature-controlled, windowless, compact structure will result in initial savings as well as in reduced operational costs.

12 Noon—“Something New in ETV.” Rev. T. J. Frain, Assistant Superintendent, Trenton, New Jersey, introduced the Rev. John M. Culkin, S.J., Boston, Massachusetts. Father Culkin outlined the advantages of ETV and the service that it can render to Catholic education.

2 P.M.—“Developing an Approach to Secondary School Religion.” Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X., Community Supervisor, Newton Highlands, Massachusetts, introduced the Very Rev. Msgr. Edgar P. McCarren, Superintendent, Rockville Centre, New York. Monsignor McCarren indicated a widespread, healthy dissatisfaction with the teaching of religion. The program must

improve, but we should not look upon it as an extreme crisis. He emphasized a need for a change in the structure of the organization of our program.

The Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem, Associate Secretary, Secondary School Department, NCEA, Washington, D.C., indicated a need for improvement in two general areas, namely, preparation of teachers and development of adequate textbooks.

3:30 P.M.—*Business Meeting*. The Program Committee presented the following report:

The Program Committee recommends that the invitation of Monsignor Foudy be accepted, and the superintendents meeting next fall be held in San Francisco.

For the meeting in Atlantic City in the spring, the following topic is suggested: Meeting the Challenge of Communications Media.

The program for the fall meeting is presently under consideration, and similar practical topics will be recommended.

It was moved and seconded to accept the Program Committee's report. Motion carried.

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

I

WHEREAS, It is the natural right of parents—a right prior to that of the State—to select the school which their children shall attend; and

WHEREAS, The parents of more than 6,000,000 American children are now sending them to private schools, and

WHEREAS, These schools render a vital public service and deserve public support, since the present and future demands of our Democracy require excellence in education for all citizens; and

WHEREAS, Aid to education is now being considered by the Congress of the United States;

Be it resolved, That the Department of Superintendents petition the Congress of the United States to include in any school legislation which might be passed provisions which will grant aid without discrimination to all schools in view of the public function performed;

Be it further resolved, That this aid include matching funds and/or long-term loans to institutions, equipment of a nonreligious nature, scholarships for teachers, tax forgiveness for parents, and all other forms of assistance that are in harmony with the Constitution of the United States.

II

WHEREAS, The Bishops of the United States, at their meeting held in Chicago, in August, 1963, reiterated the Christian principles and ideals of social justice which they had enunciated in 1943 and again in 1958; and

WHEREAS, These principles and ideals are indispensable to the promotion and improvement of human inter-relations in general and racial relations in particular; and

WHEREAS, The Catholic school should serve as a prime example of equal opportunity without regard to race; and

WHEREAS, Such a policy, once promulgated by the Bishop, is normally implemented by the Diocesan School Office;

Be it resolved, That the Department of Superintendents, National Catholic Educational Association, express its appreciation to the Bishops of the United States for their 1963 statement on racial relations, and pledge cooperation and determination, through teacher and pupil formation, in fulfilling its ideals; and

Be it further resolved, That we decry such vestiges of racial segregation as remain, either in public or in private schools, and that we pledge ourselves to correct past errors and offenses to the dignity of our fellowmen.

III

WHEREAS, The Diocese of London, Ontario, through the Most Reverend John C. Cody, D.D., LL.D., and his Auxiliary, the Most Reverend G. Emmett Carter, D.D., Ph.D., and the Very Reverend Joseph Finn, Diocesan Director of Education, and the University of Windsor has extended such warm hospitality to the members of the Superintendents Department, NCEA; and

WHEREAS, The Superintendents appreciate deeply the kindness extended by all with whom they have come in contact in Canada; and

WHEREAS, They desire by every possible means to show their deep regard and high esteem for their brother educators of the Dominion, therefore

Be it resolved, That a unanimous vote of thanks be recorded for all who have helped to bring about this historic international meeting of Catholic educators in complete understanding and wholehearted cooperation for the extension of the Kingdom of Christ upon earth.

It was moved and seconded to accept the Resolutions Committee's Report. Motion carried.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The nominating committee submitted the following names; *President*, Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate; *Vice President*, Very Rev. Msgr. R. C. Ulrich; *Secretary*, Very Rev. Msgr. James C. Donohue.

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, OCTOBER 21, 1963 Windsor, Ontario, Canada

The following members were present: Rev. Richard Kleiber, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Henry C. Bezou, Very Rev. Msgr. M. F. McAuliffe, Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, Very Rev. Msgr. R. C. Ulrich; Rt. Rev. Msgr O'Neil C. D'Amour, Associate Secretary.

1. *National Catholic Science Teachers Association*. At the St. Louis meeting Father Duggan, of Chicago, was appointed to represent the superintendents in the joint meeting of the elementary and secondary school departments. The committee discussed the possibility of affiliation, but expressed concern of too much splintering, and the matter was tabled with the suggestion that the NCEA Board establish a comprehensive program of affiliations.

2. *Manuscript on Catholicism for Public School Teachers.* Even though the request of the Standing Committee on Moral and Spiritual Values asking for a grant to initiate the preparation of the Manual on Catholicism for Public School Teachers was tabled, the second request should be made to the Executive Board of the NCEA.

3. *Membership in the Department.* Non-United States citizens in comparable positions may be admitted into the Superintendents Department as associate members.

4. *Code of Ethics for Teachers in Catholic Schools.* The Associate Secretary was instructed to refer this matter to Msgr. Bennett Applegate's Committee on Continuing Relationships Between Catholic Schools and Public Authorities.

5. *Standing Committee.* The Executive Committee approved that the chairman of the Standing Committee be appointed every three years by the committee. It empowered the Associate Secretary to implement or to reappoint.

6. *Superintendents Workshop.* Forty-two superintendents attended the workshop held at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June 24-28, 1963. It was very successful. The superintendents at the workshop were unanimous in expressing interest in continuing such projects. Marquette University is willing to sponsor another workshop this year. The Associate Secretary suggested the possibility of two workshops, one to be held in the winter in the South and another to be held in the North in the spring.

7. *Internship.* The Associate Secretary discussed the possibility of setting up for credit an internship for prospective superintendents. Offers from dioceses to accept such projects would be needed.

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MARCH 31, 1964

Atlantic City, New Jersey

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS were present: Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate, Very Rev. Msgr. R. C. Ulrich, Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Edwin Stuardi, Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, Very Rev. Msgr. M. F. McAuliffe, Rev. William M. Roche, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Henry C. Bezou, Rev. John F. Meyers, Very Rev. Msgr. James C. Donohue; also, Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour, Associate Secretary, Superintendents Department; Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem., Associate Secretary, Secondary School Department; Rev. George Moreau, and Dr. William Conley.

1. *Raising of Department Dues.* Monsignor Applegate reported on the Washington meeting of the Executive Board of NCEA. The opinion was given there that there should be a deferral of raising dues in general; that there should be no unilateral move because of the decision of the Secondary School Department to raise its dues. Father Koob, reporting for the Secondary School Department, said that dues will be charged on a sliding scale and will come out of secondary school funds. Monsignor Bezou moved that the Superintendents Department give approval to the scale outlined by Father Koob because many secondary schools would wait for such approval before remitting. The motion was passed with Monsignor Curtin refraining, because he thought the whole matter of dues, and the organization of the elementary-secondary departments under the Superintendents Department, should be more fully clarified.

2. *Affiliation of National Catholic Guidance Conference and National Catholic Educational Association.* Father George Moreau reported on the history of NCGC. He stressed the importance of a close relationship between NCGC and the office of school superintendents. He stated that NCGC is interested in some kind of affiliation but is not sure what structure it should take. A discussion took place about the value of affiliation. It was made clear that the NCGC would want to keep its autonomy. Monsignor Stuardi moved that the Executive Board recommend to the superintendents that such an affiliation would be invited and studied. It was seconded by Monsignor Bezou and passed by the Executive Committee.

3. *Status of Lay Teachers.* Dr. William Conley suggested that perhaps it would be wise to start some sort of plan for district units of lay teachers under the NCEA. Father Roche warned that any plan to organize lay teachers that would isolate them from the main stream of Catholic education should be avoided. Monsignor D'Amour said any such move would demand a complete restructuring of NCEA and should be considered carefully. It was agreed that the lay teacher situation should be studied; that status be organized. The question was, "How?" Dr. Conley explained he was appointed simply to review the possibility of lay teacher section of NCEA. At the present time, it was agreed there should not be a special section of NCEA for lay teachers.

4. STANDING COMMITTEES—

Committee on Continuing Relationships Between Catholic Schools and Public Authority. A vote of confidence and appreciation was given to the committee and its chairman, Monsignor Applegate, for the fine work done.

Committee on Uniform Statistical Reporting. This committee remains in a state of suspended animation until such time as the Carnegie Study is completed.

Committee on Moral and Spiritual Values in Public Schools. It was agreed to ask Monsignor McManus, as chairman of this committee, to report in writing as to the action on the two projects.

Committee on Moral Problems in Catholic Secondary Schools. Monsignor Kenning should be asked to report in writing as to the progress of the study of communism.

National Committee on Accreditation. It was moved and seconded that this committee, under the direction of Monsignor Felix Pitt, be given another chance. It was recommended that the committee meet in the near future in Washington to determine the direction it will take in the future.

5. *Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.* Monsignor Applegate reported there was much concern over the attitude of the CCD toward formal Catholic education in the Catholic schools. He proposed establishment of a national catechetical commission which would ultimately determine the direction of all religion teaching. After some discussion, it was agreed a resolution should be written by the Resolutions Committee concerning the role the Superintendents Department in the NCEA and the individual superintendents should play in determining how religion should be taught.

6. *Attacks upon Catholic Education.* Monsignor D'Amour called the attention of the Executive Committee to the mounting wave of criticism of our schools from within our own fold. He was of the opinion that the numbers of

such critics are not large but they are vocal. He said we need a carefully designed program to answer these critics. Monsignor Curtin said he is most anxious that the school superintendents give consideration to a National Public Relations Council. It was moved and seconded that the superintendents recommend the formation of such a council.

7. *Non-Professionals at NCEA.* The Executive Board recommended that the Superintendents Department request that the Executive Board of the NCEA approve a formal and structured meeting for school board members at the Annual Convention.

8. *Monsignor Pitt's Proposal.* Monsignor Pitt had proposed that a committee of three superintendents representing the Department be appointed to meet with three members of the exhibitors organization to discuss the whole matter of time for teachers institutes. It was recommended by the Executive Committee this be done on a national basis.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

VERY REV. MSGR. JAMES C. DONOHUE, *Secretary*
Superintendents Executive Committee, NCEA

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Atlantic City, April 2, 1964

WHEREAS, We, the members of the Department of School Superintendents, NCEA, are committed to the philosophy of education which demands the intimate association of eternal truths and moral values with every presentation of the arts and sciences; and

WHEREAS, We believe that religious truth should occupy a prominent place in the school curriculum; and

WHEREAS, We, as Christian educators have a deep and special concern for the teaching of the Christian revelation; and

WHEREAS, We, as professional educators, through research and experience understand the great need for keeping teachers of religion and their curriculum current with the demands of our times; and

WHEREAS, The Ordinary, as the principal teacher in his diocese has delegated to us the solemn responsibility for the religious education of youth in Catholic schools;

Be it hereby resolved, That we pledge ourselves to discharge this solemn obligation in the spirit of Vatican II by intensifying research in the areas of content and method and especially by increased emphasis upon the proper preparation of teachers of religion so that Catholic schools will continue their position of unique leadership in preparing Catholic youth for life in our American society.

REV. WILLIAM M. ROCHE, *Chairman*
RT. REV. MSGR. HENRY C. BEZOU
VERY MSGR. JAMES C. DONOHUE
RT. REV. MSGR. EDWARD T. HUGHES

School Superintendents Department: Officers 1964-65

President: Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate, Columbus, Ohio

Vice President: Very Rev. Msgr. R. C. Ulrich, Omaha, Nebraska

Secretary: Very Rev. Msgr. James Donohue, Baltimore, Maryland

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Edwin Stuardi, Mobile, Alabama

Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, St. Louis, Missouri

Department Executive Committee***Ex officio members***

The President, Vice President, and Secretary

Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Edwin Stuardi, Mobile, Alabama

Very Rev. Msgr. James T. Curtin, St. Louis, Missouri

Rt. Rev. Msgr. A. W. Behrens, Associate Secretary, Washington, D.C.

General Members

Very Rev. Msgr. M. F. McAuliffe, Kansas City-St. Joseph, Missouri

Rev. William M. Roche, Rochester, New York

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Henry C. Bezou, New Orleans, Louisiana

Rev. John Meyers, Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas

Rev. Richard Kleiber, Green Bay, Wisconsin

Supervisors Section

Chairman: Sister M. Celine, O.S.F., Rockford, Illinois

Vice Chairman: Sister M. De Lourdes, C.S.A., Cleveland, Ohio

Secretary: Sister Francis Eileen, S.L., Loretto Heights, Loretto, Colorado

Ex officio Members

President and Associate Secretary of the Department

Associate Secretary, Secondary School Department: Rev. C. Albert Koob, O.Praem.

Associate Secretary, Elementary School Department: Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D.

ADVISORY BOARD

Community Supervisors: Sister Hilda Marie, O.P., Chicago, Illinois

Brother Bernard Gregory, F.M.S., Bronx, New York

Diocesan Supervisors: Sister M. Bernard, O.L.M., Charleston, South Carolina

Sister M. Patrice, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Special Subject Supervisor: Sister M. Antonine, C.S.J., Milton, Massachusetts

Director of Education for Religious Community: Rev. Lorenzo Reed, S.J., New York, N.Y.

Director of Teacher Education: Sister M. Philomene, S.L., Webster Groves, Missouri

President of Department of School Superintendents: Very Rev. Msgr. Bennett Applegate, Columbus, Ohio

A Positive View of Catholic Secondary Education in the Light of Today's Crisis

RT. REV. MSGR. THOMAS P. DUFFY, S.T.D., PH.D.

Officialis, Diocese of Nashville; Pastor, Christ the King Church

WHEN THE BISHOPS of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884 decreed that the Catholic school system should be established in the United States, they had in mind, not the establishment of a state of siege against the attacking forces of non-Catholicism, but the positive idea that education is a formation, and that without religion any cultural formation is incomplete and unsatisfactory.

This is shown by the fact that at a previous meeting in Baltimore, held eleven years before our present public school system was inaugurated, the bishops had declared: "We judge it absolutely necessary that schools should be established, in which the young may be taught the principles of faith and morality, while being instructed in letters."

The difficulties in the way of establishing a complete Catholic elementary and secondary educational system at that time might well have been considered insuperable. The financial resources of the Catholic population were meagre. Most parishes were in debt. Catholics in general, then as now, were not accustomed to give according to their means. The decree that every Catholic parish should establish at least an elementary school within two years seemed wholly impractical. And yet the goal of the bishops at that time was to have every Catholic child in a Catholic school, and eventually to extend the system to secondary and college education.

That goal, with approximately 50 percent of all Catholic children in Catholic schools, is today nearer than at any other time in the history of the American Catholic school system. And yet, we find ourselves in a period of crisis, and proposals are being made by members of our lay intelligentsia to do away with the system entirely as outmoded and entirely superseded by the new spirit of ecumenism. This proposal extends to the entire system of Catholic education in this country, but it is particularly alarming as it applies to our organized system of secondary education.

For the system as it now exists, it is proposed that the emphasis in formation be shifted from youth to the adult Catholic population, that more intensive work be done through the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and the liturgical movement to mold all Catholics, but particularly parents, in the image of Christ, and this by abandoning the so-called formalism of religious instruction in the Catholic school system, to instill a living Christian faith into all Catholics.

At the risk of being considered a *laudator temporis acti*, I should, at the beginning, like to take issue with those who maintain that the Catholic school system as developed in the past eighty years has produced no noteworthy re-

sults, and is at the present time outmoded by recent developments in our pluralistic society and by conciliar tendencies toward ecumenism and the stress upon liturgy as the prime formative factor in Christian education.

Of course, our opinion of what the Catholic school in this country has accomplished is to some extent, at least, a matter of viewpoint. No human institution is perfect, and a critic may so concentrate upon the defects of the system as to miss entirely the very great benefits that have accrued from it. The optimist at the table will say, "Please pass the cream" while the pessimist will say, "Is there any milk in that pitcher?" The truth is, probably, that the pitcher contains enough half-and-half for the diner's needs.

I hope I share with the majority of you here a very optimistic view of what our schools have accomplished in this country. The Catholic Church in America is the most vigorous of all the national churches in the world. The faith of its people is the strongest, its devotion to Christian unity, its filial affection for the Holy Father, its apostolic zeal, have been commented upon from time to time by all recent popes. I do not doubt, nor do the popes, that this is attributable in large part, if not essentially, to our parochial school system and to the care we have lavished upon the education of the young.

I do not think that the family can supply the necessary religious training of the young, nor do I think the liturgy is enough to keep the faith alive. France has a warmer affection for the family than we Americans do, and its liturgy for some time has been nearer to the people than our own, celebrated in more majestic churches, staffed by a more learned clergy—yet for all that, the "eldest daughter of the Church" is today but small comfort to her Holy Mother.

And if the moral conduct of our average Catholic layman seems but little different in the eyes of our pessimistic critic from his non-Catholic neighbor, we optimists might well inquire what would be the standards of either if our Catholic school system had not leavened the whole of our American culture for the past eighty years.

In the midst of growing secularism in our nation's society, let us thank God for the freedom we still enjoy of opening our schoolday with the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, with acknowledging our dependence upon God in every class, of orienting every subject that is taught toward the final destiny of the human soul. With St. Paul's jailer we can say, "With a great price bought I this freedom," but let us cherish this freedom, even if need be, at the expense of double and triple taxation. It is worth the humiliation of having our children discriminated against in the matter of school transportation. It is worth any sacrifice that we may be called upon to make, for, as George Washington warned his fellow citizens, "Let us not entertain the supposition that morality can long endure without religion."

And let us not entertain the supposition, either, that religion can be taught adequately in a catechism class, separated from and distinct from the so-called secular subjects. It has been said that "religion is caught, not taught." The whole atmosphere of the Catholic school is an integral part of the Catholic child's education.

As a matter of fact, there are no wholly secular subjects. Some of our liberal Catholic magazines glibly state, "There is nothing religious about mathematics, and arithmetic and algebra could just as well be taught our children in the public schools." It may be true that science in the abstract has no relation to religious belief, but the philosophy of science has, and science can scarcely be taught without an underlying philosophy. Pythagoras made a religion out of numbers, and our mathematical physicists, in the explanation of

the universe, are about to do the same today with their mathematical formulas. If I may speak as one less wise, St. John in the Apocalypse did nothing to discourage the idea that there is some connection between numbers and religion, and one of the recent volumes of the Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism is entitled *Cybernetics*, a subject, which, I believe, has a great deal to do with mathematics. The pertinence of religion is obvious in subjects like history and literature, and I am not entirely out of sympathy with the old Benziger geography which noted that Nashville and Mobile are Episcopal sees.

But what of the present-day crisis, which, some think, demands a reappraisal of our approach to the question of Christian formation? The crisis has two horns, which are not the horns of a dilemma but prod with equal urgency from either side. The first and sharpest is the denial of a need for a Catholic school system in this country; indeed, the desirability of terminating it in the interest of ecumenism and the needs and goals of a pluralistic society. The second is the ever increasing difficulty of attaining the established goal of every child in a Catholic school.

Let us take the second of the critical points first. Granted that we want a Catholic school system, is it practically possible to maintain one with anything like the optimism of former years which hoped eventually to make a complete Catholic education available to every Catholic student?

The difficulties lie in the immense increase in the numbers of Catholic children applying for admission to Catholic schools, and the apparent decrease in the number of religious vocations; in the ever increasing cost of education in general; and in particular, in the cost of maintaining Catholic schools without any kind of government subsidy.

At the risk of seeming impractical, let us note, first, that the impossibility of attaining a goal, at least in the foreseeable future, is not sufficient reason for abandoning the goal, if it is a desirable goal, not to say an essential one. When Christ our Lord said to us, "Be ye perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect," He proposed to us an absolutely impossible goal. No one can be perfect as God the Father is perfect. And yet, we may not cease to strive toward that goal, which means that we must never be satisfied with our present degree of goodness, but must strive always to better ourselves.

So when we propose as the goal of the Catholic educational system in this country, that it be extended to every Catholic child, we mean simply that we must never stop our efforts to expand it. It should be rather an encouragement to us than a cause of despair that in eighty years we have extended it to more than half of the Catholic student population.

The whole Catholic system of elementary and secondary education as proposed by the Council of Baltimore was, of course, predicated upon the availability of religious men and women, and of priests, who would staff these institutions at a cost far below that which would be required for the employment of lay people. Now, it is evident that at the present time religious personnel is not available in sufficient numbers to staff our school system. But the lack is not entirely due to a dearth of vocations to the religious life.

Sister Bertande Meyer, in an excellent article entitled "Vanishing Sisters?" in *Ave Maria* (February 8, 1964) explains the shortage of teaching sisters:

Ten years ago, [she writes], long before the press got worried—the major supervisors of communities large and small saw that "too few Sisters" was only a symptom.

The root of the problem was that *too many sisters* had been sent too early in their religious life, without sufficient spiritual and professional preparation, into the critical field of teaching. These sisters, answering the urgent call of harassed bishops and pastors, were obliged to get their degrees and fulfill state requirements "on the run," and could make little more of their own educational process than a numerical amassing of courses and credits.

The reverend mothers' answer to "too few Sisters" was indeed courageous. They would—and forthwith did—increase the fewness by refusing to send any more Sisters into the teaching field until they were spiritually formed, intellectually well-grounded and professionally trained. This meant that the situation would become worse, before it would become better and indeed very much better.

The process took a minimum of five years and freed each Sister forever from any haunting unease as to her adequacy both as a nun and as a teacher . . .

It was precisely in the decade of 1950-60 when the flow of Sisters into the schools slowed to a trickle, and more experienced Sisters were sent on for higher studies, that the enrollment of the parochial schools soared to a 171 percent increase in grade schools and 174 percent increase in high schools. The "population explosion" alone could hardly account for that, since during the same decade the public schools increased only 142 percent in the grades and 148 percent in the high schools.

Although we can hope with Sister Bertrande that the number of sisters available for the schools will soon be much larger in proportion to the number of students, and that the population explosion has reached its crest and will subside, the fact remains that for many years to come, if not permanently, the Catholic school system will have to rely upon lay people as a supplementary task force, indeed an integral part of our teaching staffs. This will continue to raise the cost of Catholic education, particularly on the secondary level, where we can scarcely expect competent teachers to work for less than they might receive in the public school system.

Where is the money to come from? In the immediate future, I fear it must come from the Catholic people. At present, most secondary schools in the diocesan systems are supported in varying ratios partly by tuition, partly by contributions or assessments made upon the parishes involved. As Catholics cease to be a permanently underprivileged group in this country, and take their place upon an equal basis with others in the economic life of the country, the all-too-prevalent token contribution to the Church must give place to a substantial support of the Church and its activities. It is, I believe, conceded that Catholics in general contribute far less per capita than the active members of other Christian communities.

Certainly, federal aid, even if it were given in some form or other, would cover only a small part of the cost of Catholic education. Eventually, the financial burden must be borne by the states, and some equitable means must be found for Catholics to have the benefit for school purposes of the taxes which they, along with other citizens, pay into the state treasuries. Those means are not yet apparent, but as the Catholic population increases, and continues to represent in ever increasing percentage of the total population, some means of subsidy satisfactory to the whole population will be found. There are examples of such subsidies now in the various provinces of our neighbor, Canada, as well as in other Commonwealths of the British Empire, and in many more or less religiously pluralistic countries of Europe. To that end, the Catholic school system should no longer be thought of as essen-

tially a private system of schools. Too large a segment of the population frequent them for the state to neglect its responsibility toward them.

Nor need this recognition of its duty on the part of the state result in state control of Catholic education. We would do well to make our own and to strive to propagate the following principles drawn up by the bishops of England and Wales, and which are in accord with decisions of our own Supreme Court on education:

1. It is no part of the normal function of the State to teach.
2. The State is entitled to see that citizens receive due education sufficient to enable them to discharge the duties of citizenship in its various degrees.
3. The State ought, therefore, to encourage every form of sound educational endeavor, and may take means to safeguard the efficiency of education.
4. To parents whose economic means are insufficient to pay for the education of their children, it is the duty of the State to furnish the necessary means, providing them from the common funds arising out of the taxation of the whole community. But in so doing the State must not interfere with parental responsibility, nor hamper the reasonable liberty of parents in their choice of a school for their children. Above all, where the people are not all of one creed, there must be no differentiation on the ground of religion.¹

In dioceses where the difficulties of maintaining a complete Catholic educational system are so pressing that some temporary curtailment is necessary, ordinaries make it clear that secondary education is to be safeguarded. Thus, in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, where the first grade is to be dropped from the elementary system next year, the Archbishop, in a brochure issued to the people of the archdiocese, makes it clear that "High Schools are the Principal Feature of the Plan." The funds to be saved by the elimination of the first grade are to be used for the benefit of Catholic high schools.

In other dioceses where catechetical centers have been established, school authorities have declared that these are not intended to replace the Catholic schools. Thus, the Superintendent of Schools in Rochester, New York, Father William M. Roche, in a letter to the priests of the diocese, under date of February 18, 1964, says: "The Diocese of Rochester has not in the past, nor does it envision in the future, any substitution of Catechetical Centers for our present effort in Catholic Schools. As everyone knows, there is no comparison between the preparation afforded a Catholic youngster in a Catholic school where Religion permeates all phases of the curriculum, and the preparation afforded them in a public school, under the present interpretations of the Constitution. Our Ordinary, Bishop James E. Kearney, and Auxiliary Bishop, Bishop Lawrence B. Casey, thoroughly subscribe to this point of view."

What, then, of the thesis that the Catholic school system is no longer desirable? Aside from the difficulties of financing and staffing such a system, some Catholic writers in recent months have argued that the entire Catholic system of education is a relic of the siege mentality, which is no longer applicable to present conditions; that general education can and should be separated from religious formation in these times and in this country; that the Catholic schools, because of financial handicaps, are mediocre; that even the religious education presented in them is too formal to have any real

¹ Quoted from *Our National Enemy No. 1, Education without Religion*, by John F. Noll.

effect in life; that they are divisive in a pluralistic society; that they are contrary to the new spirit of ecumenism; and that they consume time, effort, and money which might better be spent upon adult formation in Catholic Centers and Newman Clubs.

Mary Perkins Ryan in her book "Are Parochial Schools the Answer?" has presented all of these objections in a sincere and forceful manner, with great emphasis upon the new liturgy and the spirit of ecumenism, which, the author hopes, will provide a much sounder basis for the new spirit of Catholicism in this country than the outmoded school system. This book provides a summary of all the objections which might be leveled either by non-Catholics or well-meaning Catholics against the Catholic school system.

An analysis of the book with answers to its objections has been prepared by Sister Rose Matthew, I.H.M., director of Graduate School, Marygrove College, Detroit, Michigan. The analysis may be obtained through the Department of Schools of the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, and may be already known to most of you. With apologies to Sister Rose Matthew, I should like to cite some of her salient points which might not yet have come to the attention of everyone:

1. That the Catholic school system need not be considered a relic of the "siege mentality" is evidenced by "the contemporary growth of schools among other religious denominations, particularly those of the Lutheran and Baptist faiths. The religious school is a "recognized means of controlling the pressures on young minds until such time as they can operate with mature judgment and a philosophy capable of meeting the dehumanizing impact of the technical age."

2. General education cannot be separated from the religious formation in these times and in this country. "We have in the United States a formalized, technological culture. To attempt to influence or inform a formal system by informal means is unrealistic in this day. Again, the public schools of our American culture cannot succeed in transmitting the American heritage when this heritage is basically a religious one and religion is increasingly determined to be *outside* the sphere of the public school."

3. The problem of mediocrity is something which the Catholic schools share with all other schools. It is a challenge rather than a discouragement.

4. The issue between "freedom" and "formalism" is not conclusive. Perhaps formalism is confused with order and deliberate planning.

5. The home is not prepared to take over the religious formation of children. The school is the best means to prepare future parents to assist in this formation.

6. The issue of divisiveness is not well taken. "To work effectively for the common good is certainly the obligation of every Christian. To work for the common good, however, requires very clear thinking and much practical preparation lest one slip into the fallacy of equating 'common' good with 'majority' good as is so frequently done with our democratic mentality." A democratic pluralistic society certainly does not require that everyone be educated in the same system.

7. Ecumenism must not be confused with religious emotionalism. "Ecumenism implies a coming to grips with existing situations in the light of a basic and vital philosophy and theology. Liberalizing spontaneity and inner commit-

ment rise from reasoned convictions of distinct personal and common goals and means consistent with them. Action based on any other concept of ecumenism would necessarily result in chaos."

These are a few of the ideas culled from Sister Rose Matthew's "analysis," which justify our Catholic school system, and particularly our system of secondary education.

Granted that our system, which, indeed, is the envy of the whole Catholic world, and which has produced so much good in the past, is capable of meeting the present crisis, both in the world of ideas and in the world of hard financial facts, in what areas can we hope for improvements in the system, particularly on the secondary level?

1. For at least thirty years, there have been efforts made, and some progress achieved in the teaching of religion in our high schools. Research and experimentation along psychological, liturgical, and ecumenical lines must continue among those especially trained in this field in order to bring about a truer religious formation.

2. The educated laity must be admitted more and more into the councils of school management. Some dioceses have approved and encourage lay membership on diocesan school boards and an active participation by laymen in the formation of school policies. This has the double advantage of bringing in fresh ideas and drawing the clergy and laity together for the solution of common problems. Even on the parish level, the pastor's solicitude for the school may be interpreted as clerical domination if the laity are not consulted. There is, unfortunately, some evidence of an incipient anti-clericalism in this country, which ought to be remedied before it does harm to the Church, as it has in other countries.

3. The religious formation of children in non-Catholic schools needs more serious attention, as does also the formation of adults who may aid in the homes and in the schools.

4. The encouragement of vocations to the religious life and to the priesthood, in the high schools, will help to solve many of the personnel problems of the school system. Faculty members trained in modern methods of guidance are essential.

5. Lay members of the faculty should be fully integrated into the teaching staff, and their salaries and benefits should make their positions attractive to talented teachers.

The Catholic school system was established by the bishops of this country because they believed that without religion any cultural formation is incomplete. Today, as secularism takes a firmer hold upon the public school system, that belief has greater relevance to the needs of the times than it had eighty years ago. As a technological culture develops and is fostered by the powerful resources of government in public school education, an informal religious education in the home and through the liturgy becomes increasingly inadequate. Catholic schools today serve not only the needs of the Church, but the needs of the nation.

This is particularly true of the secondary level of education. It is during adolescence that the student comes to grips with the conflicting ideologies of a pluralistic society. The stabilizing influence of religion is more important at that time than at any other period of life.

In spite of difficulties, some of which are of a temporary nature, the bishops have wisely chosen to continue to maintain our high schools even at the price of some curtailment of elementary education. It is to be hoped that with the solution of some of our problems which time will bring, the original goal of "every Catholic child in a Catholic school" will not seem too impractical an ideal.

The Essential Role and Formation of the Teacher of High School Religion

(Summary)

REV. JOSEPH A. NOVAK, S.J.

Fordham University

THE TEACHING of high school religion is both a unique challenge and a privileged opportunity. Like John the Baptist, the teacher of religion is a man sent by God. He is God's herald in today's world, whose sacred mission it is to teach God's truth and to bring God's life and love to His children at this critical period of their lives.

His teaching objective is to transmit the Christian message in such a way as to elicit from the student a response of faith which is mature and personal and which includes the triple faith dimension described by St. Thomas: belief, trust, and loving commitment. The message which he transmits is not a set of abstract truths. It is a living Person. It is Jesus Christ Himself.

Religious education, therefore, is a drama involving three real, living people: Christ, the student, and the teacher. In this three-fold inter-personal relationship, it is the teacher's privilege to be the human bridge on which the student meets Christ in the encounter of faith.

Thus, the ultimate success of our efforts as teachers of religion is not to be measured by the marks achieved in final examinations, nor by the student's intellectual grasp of Christian truth. It is ultimately realized most fully in the religious impact it makes upon the student's life, that is, the extent to which the light and life which is Christ, the sum of our teaching, lives and grows within him.

Our role as teachers is to prepare our students most effectively for this encounter. We do this by fulfilling four different aspects of this teaching role.

1. *The teacher is a friend.* Before he can effectively reach his students to bring them God's message of love as found in Christ, the teacher must be accepted by them as a person and as a friend, as someone who is human and understanding, as someone who is interested in them as persons and is concerned about them; as someone, finally, who is a part of their real world.

2. *The teacher is an educator.* As an educator the teacher works with his students as they are, and begins his teaching by drawing upon the

knowledge and the good which is already within them. He capitalizes on their personal characteristics, their past experiences, and their present circumstances. He adapts his teaching to their particular needs and helps them to realize from their own experience the relevance of Christ and His teachings to their personal lives.

3. *The teacher is an instructor.* Instructors of religion must make a solidly intellectual presentation of the Christian message as it is revealed by God in its wonder and unity in the Bible, in liturgy, in the Church's teaching and in its living witness. This does not mean an abstract or an unreal presentation of dry bones of religious doctrine. It can and should be a vital instruction addressed to the whole person, not to the intellect *or* the will, but to the boy or girl who thinks, feels, and loves.

4. *The teacher is a witness.* It is true that the teacher does not and cannot *teach* faith and commitment. But he can and he should teach *as one who is himself committed* to the Way, the Truth, and the Life which he is striving to communicate. It may well be that it is in and through his teacher that a student has his most meaningful encounter with Christ.

The second part of this paper deals with the formation of teachers for this challenging apostolate. There are three main areas to be considered.

1. *His human formation as a person.* Any teacher first teaches by being himself, by being a particular person with his own individuality and personal qualities. In his formation, attention should be given to the development of his human personality and to the gradual realization and fulfillment of himself as a person with warmth, understanding, cheerfulness, approachability, and love.

2. *His Christian formation as a witness.* Since he teaches by what he is as much as by what he says, the teacher of religion must represent a true and not a false image of Christ. Hence, the importance of his Christian formation and his daily growth in Christ's likeness through prayer and frequent participation in the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

3. *His professional formation as an educator and instructor.* There are three interrelated phases essential to the integrated professional formation of religion teachers: basic theological foundations in solid content; kerygmatic orientations of this content with a view toward maximum religious impact upon today's students; and, finally, training in creative and effective pedagogical approaches.

One important and consoling fact remains to be emphasized. All teachers of religion feel somewhat inadequate before this challenging mission. But we must always remember that this is primarily God's undertaking and we are his chosen instruments. The Holy Spirit is always at work in us and in our students, adding power to our feeble teaching efforts, shedding light upon their understanding, and giving them inspiration and assistance to live according to this light.

The teacher of religion, in conclusion, is a man sent by Christ to bring the Christ Who is within him to the Christ Who lives in his students. Such a work, begun with Christ, done by Christ, and ending in Christ—this is the privileged role of the teacher of high school religion.

Approaches to the Old Testament for High School Catechists and Students

REV. ALDO J. TOS

Cardinal Spellman High School, Bronx, New York

THESE ARE WONDERFUL TIMES in which to be alive. The activity of the Holy Spirit, so much in evidence throughout the Church, gives promise of producing results which will rival those of the First Pentecostal experience. Countless hearts beat with the hope raised by the beloved Pope John XXIII and strengthened by Pope Paul VI. Many look to the Second Vatican Council for that "new springtime" in the life of the Church, the People of God, which Pius XII said was not far off. Renewal, revival, reform—*aggiornamento*—these words and desires are everywhere in the Church. It is not surprising that they should be the marks of contemporary catechists.

Our times have special problems demanding solutions: scientific and technological advances, the rise of new nations, presence of secularism and materialism, the challenge of militant atheism, racial segregation, the loss of the moral sense among many—to name only a few. Our age needs committed Christians who are ready for the challenge of the moment, ready to respond to the call of God which comes to them so that through them it can reach "all the nations of the earth." Our age needs Christians who will see religion as involving more than the salvation of their own souls; Christians who understand the implications of the Lord's prayer, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done." And it needs Catholic schools that are committed to the formation of such Christians *in fact* and not merely *in words*.

The Religion class, unlike all other classes in the daily routine of the student, always involves a religious experience—at least, it should. God speaks to His People and He expects a response; God acts, he expects a reaction. Information can never be the sole desired outcome of a class in Religion. Encounter with God through His Word, deeper understanding and participation in the Christian Mystery, response through active and intelligent liturgical worship, active charity, dedicated apostolate—these are enough to warn against that false complacency which is gratified when students are so well taught that they know all the answers. Our teaching of the saving deeds of God must be more than a recital of past occurrences without relevance to the lives of our students and the world of 1964, 1965, and so on. Our catechesis must be more than essentially correct; it must be *existentially meaningful*, applicable to the lives of the students and to the problems of the world. Otherwise, we will be curators of a museum of lifeless truths, not heralds of Him who came so that men would have life in abundance.

The Bible, the Word of God in words of men, recounts and praises the great acts of God. It permits us and our students to enter into the life of the People of the Old Covenant, and it prepares us for a fuller and richer involvement in the life of the People of the New Covenant—*our*

life! Intelligent and religious understanding of the Bible will show our students how the roots of our religion are found in the great acts performed by God for His people, and particularly in the great, unique act of Jesus, His Paschal Mystery—His Passion, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension. The Bible will help our students to capture the spirit of our ancestors in the history of salvation; it will help them to live it in the present as they meet the challenge of the moment, and with Jesus, prepare for their "hour." The Bible in our classrooms brings the Word of God Himself to our students. It is God Himself speaking to His People, encouraging a divine-human dialogue, carried on by the power of the Spirit who urges us to say "Abba," Father!

The Bible—The Old Testament in particular—is made up of deeds and events that are concrete, not abstract. At times it is disconcerting to many of us until we remind ourselves of the early stage of revelation to which many of the events must be related. Whether we read or hear the simple often naive, popular stories of the book of Genesis—the account of the exodus from Egypt, the Sinai covenant, the oracles of the prophets—we are immediately involved in an exchange, an encounter marked by words that remain close to those realities which we often meet in our own lives and those of our contemporaries. The very concreteness of the Old Testament is an inspired pedagogical source for high school catechists faced with bringing the message of salvation to adolescents of the twentieth century who want a "down to earth" approach. They can identify with the men and women of the Bible, and they gain both insight and hope from the fact that God chose such men and women and that He often forgave their weaknesses and sins. "There is hope for me," says the adolescent. Our students need an approach to religion in which essential dogmatic and moral truths and demands find concrete manifestation in life. The question is: How do we use the Old Testament in our catechesis with adolescents who seem more interested in the Beatles than in being young men and women of the Bible? I do not pretend to offer solutions to this and related questions, but I should like to set before you some of the approaches that I have used.

Much progress has been made in biblical scholarship during the last few decades. Century-old opinions which had come to be considered *the* Catholic views on such things as the actual existence of a Garden of Eden, the reality of a talking serpent, the great ages of early Semitic heroes, the grandiose exit of the Hebrews from Egypt, the stopping of the Sun at Gabaon, the interpretation of the "Messianic prophecies"—all have been carefully re-studied by competent and dedicated biblical scholars and theologians. The result has been new interpretations based on more recent theological, historical, ethnological, and archaeological studies.

Premature popularization of new hypotheses is imprudent. But to be unaware of what is generally accepted by loyal and competent Catholic biblical scholars would bespeak severe limitation, if not failure, in our vocation as catechists charged with bringing the Word of God to His People in the classroom. Faith, total commitment to Christ in the Church, charity, hard work, and a good measure of common sense, will preserve us from the scruples and the fears of the faint-hearted and the extravagances of the rationalist and unbeliever. But there are solidly established points which must be known by catechists if they are to fulfill their mission accurately and effectively.

I should like to offer some suggestions in approaching the Old Testament

in our high school catechesis. Within the time at our disposal, we can consider only a few topics. But I hope that these will be of some help to you as they have been to me in catechizing boys and girls in high school. I shall comment on five topics: (1) Geography and chronology as the eyes of biblical history; (2) The literary evolution of the books of the Old Testament; (3) The importance of the thought patterns and imagery of the authors; (4) The literary forms in the Old Testament, and (5) The role of the Psalms in the prayer-life of students.

First, *Geography and chronology as the eyes of biblical history*. We have to keep in mind that the history of salvation during the period of the Old Covenant developed in a particular land among a particular people. The land of Canaan, the holy land, or Palestine "land of the Philistines"—as the Romans called it in order to obliterate the memory of the "land of the Jews"—was the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham. It is only through understanding this land, its geography and topography, that we will be able to comprehend the people and the literature which developed chiefly within its confines. "The land of Palestine, torn by war, honeycombed with vice and corruption, consecrated by the true worship of God, is the stage on which Israel's prophets proclaimed their divine message" (Barnabas M. Ahern, C.P.). The study of Palestine at once impresses us with the apologetic value in the fact of its immense religious importance and its geographical insignificance. Why is it that this land destitute of all that is considered essential for worldly success and influence should be the land that has given the world religions that have influenced all mankind: Judaism and Christianity? Certainly, the hand of the Lord has rested on Palestine! Besides the geography of the country, catechists need a solid grasp of the other "eye" of biblical history—chronology. It is when we have a firm understanding of the chronology of the great events in the history of salvation, that we can understand the progressive development of God's plan for mankind and appreciate the love, mercy, and patience of a Father who has been and is still faithful to His people. Chronology from the call of Abraham around 1850 B.C. to the Incarnation of Jesus in 7-6 B.C. with its cycles of love and sin, fidelity and infidelity, weal and woe, covenant-making, covenant-rejection and covenant-renewal on the part of the Israelites, illustrates realistically the theme of Francis Thompson's *Hound of Heaven* and the implications in Gerard Manley Hopkins' well-known line: "The Holy Ghost over the bent world broods with warm breast and with ah! bright wings."

Secondly, *The literary evolution of the books of the Old Testament*. Many imagine that the Bible is simply the collection of various books exactly as they came from the pens of inspired authors. Scholars say that we do not know with certainty the names of the authors of the books of the Old Testament. Long before the books of the Old Testament existed as a collection of written works they circulated in the form of oral preaching and teaching to a great extent. Our dependence on the written word often stifles the faculty of memory and poetic and artistic insight suffers. In ancient Israel things were different. Popular stories, some of them purified of their polytheistic elements (for example, the accounts of creation and the flood which have some affinity to the Babylonian myths known as *Enuma elish* and *Gilgamesh Epic*), others concerned with the exploits of the patriarchs and other national heroes, as well as the weal and woes of the

country, were often recalled, transformed, and used to bring out the profound theological purposes of the Lord, Yahweh, He who is always with His People. We have to remember that the ancient Israelites observed an important rule: *Sacred writings must not be nameless*. Therefore, every book in the collection of Holy Scripture was attributed to some important person, a liberator, a prophet, a wise man, a king. The books of the Pentateuch or Torah were attributed to Moses, the great lawgiver at the time of Israel's birth as a covenant people at Sinai; the Psalms were associated with David who was known to have been a musician and singer of sorts; the Book of Wisdom was attributed to Solomon who was remembered as the wise man par excellence and about whom there was much folklore, including a story about his clever tactic of ordering a child to be cut in two knowing that the mother would never be satisfied with "half a child" (3 Kings 2, 16-28). This approach of the ancient Israelites to the authorship of the books of the Old Testament has to be kept in mind if we are to use the books intelligently, particularly when it is certain that in their present state they come from a period far removed from the time of the person with whom they are connected. The ancient Israelites were not so much expressing human authenticity of the books as affirming the divine origin of the books in their sacred collection. These observations should help us to understand that we have an "inspired tradition" and not merely an "inspired author" involved in the production of the literature of the Old Testament. The biblical authors asked themselves what the books received from previous generations meant for the present generation. Consequently the books, first in an oral form and later written, were "brought up to date." There was no perversion or destruction of the original meaning of the book. The message was sacred, and no one would dare change it essentially. Explanatory expressions and new insights were added. Thus, the wonderful deeds of God were made meaningful to the people of the present who were the heirs of the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The role of the Temple was particularly important in the transmission of the biblical books. Slowly, progressively, and aided by the divine assistance which we call "inspiration," the books took shape. Probably, there were at first just short "cultic creeds" like the one in Deuteronomy 26 which contained the expression of faith of the Israelite in the Lord, Yahweh. Then, in a living tradition, the books developed. God, indeed, was directing the process through the mystery of inspiration. Human authors and redactors were his living reasonable instruments, and the temple priests and Levites were the ones who supervised the new editions. Finally, during the post-exilic period, sometime after 538 B.C., the books of the Old Testament attained their present form.

Third, *The importance of the thought patterns and imagery of the authors*. Because the Old Testament took shape and color from the ancient world of the Near East, we have to keep in mind various things about their authors. The ancient Semites were largely innocent of the logical, philosophical, and scientific categories which are very basic to our way of thinking. If the biblical writers' views about the construction of the world, and the things in it, are to be meaningful and relevant to moderns, their climate of thought and expression has to be captured and understood. The contributions of archaeology are invaluable in this regard, particularly those at places like Mari, Ugarit, Nippur, Ur, Qumran, to name just a few. A particular age and locale are often mirrored in the literary works produced. The inspired authors wrote at a certain time, in a particular environment.

They used the language of their contemporaries. Their personalities naturally influenced their works. The differences of character of Amos and Isaiah will be seen in the way that the two authors composed their works, although both were the instruments of the Lord and their works are the Word of God. Pius XII said: "As the substantial Word of God became like to men in all things, 'except sin,' so the words of God, expressed in human language, are made like to human speech in every respect except error." There is no "error" in the Bible so long as we understand the purposes the authors had in mind and the type of writing they used to achieve their purposes. How much misunderstanding and misguided teaching could have been avoided in the past if this basic rule had been observed! How much of the controversy between science and the Bible could have been avoided if more care had been given to this rule which now seems so self-evident.

Fourth, *The literary forms in the Old Testament books*. Pius XII in the encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* said that the ancient peoples of the East in expressing their ideas, "did not always employ those forms or kinds of speech which we use today, but rather those used by the men of their times and countries." We must resist the temptation to treat the Old Testament as a product of twentieth-century European and American thought. A literary form (genre) is the manner of expression which an author chooses to present his thought. Every author has the right to expect his readers to keep his purpose and methods in mind when they read his work. This is true of authors like Dante, particularly in his *Divine Comedy*, and Shakespeare in his historical plays, *Caesar* and *Henry IV*. This is also true of the authors of the books of the Old Testament who have used parable, fable, poetry, satire, love stories, and history according to the manner of the ancient Semites. These forms are not always readily recognizable and appreciated by modern readers. How much is missed, even the entire religious meaning of the accounts, if we are unaware of the type of writing used by the authors whom God chose as His instruments. I wonder what the people of 3000 and 4000 A.D. will say when they discover such contemporary literature as *The Sound and the Fury* by William Faulkner, *Orlando* by Virginia Woolf, *The Lord of the Flies* by William Golding, and *Catcher in the Rye* by J. P. Salinger. What will those people of the future think about us and our behavior when they discover articles and notes written by adolescents who have given us the title of "squares"?

Perhaps, the most difficult literary form for the modern reader of the Old Testament is what is generally called the historical form. Much of the historical writing that we are used to has been greatly influenced by the historico-critical methodology of authors such as Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886), the "father of modern scientific history," Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903), and Eduard Meyer (1885-1930). We have come to expect that a piece of historical writing will be an accurate, objective presentation of what occurred at a particular time and place. It is true that the Hebrew authors were not indifferent to the objective realities of their people's history—but their outlook was theological and not historico-critical. The Old Testament books contain history written in the Semitic manner, which often used a style characterized by popular, anecdotal, and epic qualities. The books of Genesis, Exodus, Josue, Judges, Samuel, and Kings are examples of this literary form. Embedded in them we have the record of the development of the People of God from the call of Abraham to the Exodus, the conquest of Canaan, the rise and fall of the kingdoms of Israel and Juda. To read

these books with our twentieth-century Western mentality very often is to expect what their authors did not intend to give. This I think is a most important point to remember. It does not mean that we take a lax approach to the proper understanding of the Bible, an approach that uses the answer, "That's only a way of speaking, it's not meant to be taken literally" whenever there are difficulties in the text. But, it does mean that we will have far more answers for the inquisitive minds of our adolescent students if we ourselves are properly and solidly prepared to understand the many and varied literary forms in the biblical books.

For example, if we keep in mind the literary evolution of the Old Testament literature we will realize that the Pentateuch is the result of a combination of various sources, commonly called "traditions," which developed from the time of Abraham in the nineteenth century B.C. to shortly after the Babylonian Exile in the sixth century B.C. The books of Genesis and Exodus were for a long time part of the sacred recitals at the shrines of Israel and at the Temple. These accounts included a good deal of popular folklore as well as liturgical recitals of the deeds which the Lord had performed in favor of His People. Consequently, the books intended for the people of the time were hardly scientific recitals. The world-structure was described as it looked to Semites of the time—a simple, flat, dome-covered world which received water through floodgates in the firmament or sky and light from both the sun and, when the sun was not visible in the sky, from a mysterious separate source. Priests interested in the Sabbath rest and worship would emphasize that day of the week. Thus you have the origins of the creation story in Genesis which uses the literary device of six-day work week and a seventh day of rest. It is a story which presents creation in popular, nonscientific terms, with, for instance, light appearing before the sun. It is important that our students understand that there can be two different views about the same thing—one scientific and one popular. This will help them to understand the viewpoint of the biblical authors which, in general, is popular, nonscientific, and meant for a less cultured people of a few millennia ago.

The account of the Garden of Eden is the continuation of a popular story suited to the mentality of the ancient Semitic world. It is so simple, almost naive, that we tend to rush over it quickly. The story is the human vehicle through which God speaks to us today as He spoke to His people of the Old Covenant. Distinguishing what is the truth taught from the way in which it is taught—the literary form—we can say that as Catholics we do not have to maintain the existence of a garden, the tree, and a real talking serpent. We do not know what the sin of the first humans was; the eating of the fruit was a literary device used to represent an act rooted in pride and disobedience. But most adolescents will appreciate the psychology of temptation which the author skillfully presents in the story.

The inflated figures used to denote the ages of the legendary heroes in the early chapters of Genesis were hardly intended to be taken seriously. Like their Babylonian neighbors who gave astronomical ages to their kings—one of whom is said to have ruled for 72,000 years!—the Hebrews used symbolic numbers to bridge the gap of the period, as they understood it, between the beginning of the human race and the next great event in the story, for example, the Flood. The story of the Flood combining as it does two divergent accounts, was a primitive, masterly parable intended to teach the theological lesson of the power of God, the terrible nature of

sin, its spread, man's wickedness, God's punishment of the bad, and His mercy toward the good. Time does not permit further examples from the early chapters of Genesis, but I hope that those given are enough to show you how contemporary biblical scholarship interprets these chapters which are fundamentally concerned with a popular presentation of the origins of the world, the human race, and the chosen people—as well as the great theological facts of God's love and man's fidelity and sinfulness.

The book of Exodus often presents problems for readers and especially for catechists. Yet, without an adequate understanding of its literary and historical contents, as well as its theological and liturgical teachings, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to realize the true nature of the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist which are so intimately concerned with the Exodus and Passover of Christ and the Christian. The authors of the Gospels and Epistles used the fact of the Exodus and the theological themes associated with it to present Jesus—the New Moses, New Israel who underwent a pass-over to the Father. He, the unblemished and undefiled Lamb by His Paschal Mystery—His Death, Resurrection and Ascension—takes away the sins of the world, establishes a new Covenant, a New People, and gives a New Law.

Exodus is a great religious epic built around a man, Moses, and an event central to the life of Israel, the Exodus Covenant. The style of the book is grand, heroic, and majestic and it shows evidences of the influence of the liturgical service of the Passover, especially in chapters 1-15. The annual recital of the events of the first exodus from Egypt influenced the composition of the book, and as a result the historical events are often "camouflaged" by details which are intended to emphasize the saving power of Yahweh, the Lord who is always with His people. The plagues, so similar to the natural phenomena of Egypt, the number who left the country, the crossing of the Sea of Reeds—these and other details are "heaven sent" episodes for a Hollywood version of *The Ten Commandments*, but they are hardly things to delay a catechist who should be interested in the religious message of Exodus and its importance for the Christian adolescent of today. Like his spiritual ancestors, the adolescent has crossed from sin through saving waters (baptism), is nourished by bread from heaven (Eucharist), and must renew the covenant with God, which he does in every Mass. We must be careful not to lose ourselves in archaeological and scientific questions which are more concerned with "how" and "where" things took place than with the religious purpose of the event. It is the theological significance of the Exodus from a land of slavery, suffering, and sin that must be presented to our students, with a minimum of the scientific apparatus which is necessary to quench their intellectual thirst for answers to the "how" and the "where" of the events. This should also be kept in mind when we deal with such books as Josue and Judges in which the authors have used hyperbole, numerical exaggerations, and have suppressed human factors in order to highlight the divine causality involved in Israel's victory.

Fifth, *the role of the Psalms in the prayer-life of students*. The Psalter is the collection of the religious songs of Israel—a collection that developed throughout the history of the People of the Old Covenant. The religious value of the Psalms is evident to all who pray them. In them God has inspired the sentiments that His People should have toward Him. They were recited by Jesus—the Psalter was His prayerbook—by the apostles, and the Church has used them in the liturgy throughout the centuries. They should be used in the formation of our students in deep, personal and com-

munal prayer. In this age of liturgical renewal, it is imperative that our students learn to pray the Psalms which are an important part of the worship of the Church. These prayers afford a simplicity and strength which are essential requisites for sincere praying. I am convinced that adolescents will find them meaningful. Their faith, commitment to Christ, grows deeper as they pray the powerful words of Psalm 22, "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want." Their confidence in God increases as they make their own the sentiment expressed in the words: "Even though I walk in the dark valley I fear no evil, for you are there with your rod and your staff that give me courage." Students find their trust in the Lord deepening as they become aware of the implications of the words of Psalm 26: "Though an army encamp against me, my heart will not fear; though war be waged upon me, even then will I trust." Adolescent boys and girls can and do learn a great deal about their relationship with Christ and the effects of sin on that relationship as they pray meaningfully the words of Psalm 31: "Happy is he whose fault is taken away, whose sin is covered . . . As long as I would not speak, my bones wasted away with my groaning all the day, for day and night your hand was heavy upon me." Our students learn to express true contrition with Psalm 50, thanksgiving with Psalm 9, and praise with Psalm 150. These are only a few examples of how the Psalms can be used to enrich the prayer-life of our students as well as our own. Psalms can be used before classes and assemblies, and in preparation for the sacraments. They are, of course, most appropriate during the liturgy of the Mass.

CONCLUSION

St. Paul told the Thessalonians that they were to "test all things, and hold fast to that which is good" (1 Thes. 5, 21). This advice must be kept in mind in this age of renewal and development in high school catechetics. It has to be applied to our attitudes and approaches to the Bible especially.

The Old Testament helps us to understand the providential design of our loving Father who has called us to be His People and Who guides us during our march toward the land of promise, the heavenly Jerusalem. It teaches us and our students to see the presence of the eternal in time, and to understand better the actions of Him Who is the Lord of history. The Old Testament helps us to be really convinced that our success is truly dependent on our response and fidelity to the demands of the Covenant. It teaches us the faithfulness of God. Through sign and symbol, words and persons, He intervenes in our world to draw us to Himself. He communicates His life to His People, and, with our cooperation, acts to bring about His universal reign.

The Mystery of Christ

REV. JOSEPH D. DILLON

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

ONE OF THE CHIEF FRUITS that has come forth from the modern catechetical movement is a clear statement of the aim of religious formation as a living faith. The teacher is cast in the role of trying to initiate and deepen dynamic living relationship between God and the student. This biblical concept of faith is both intellectual and personal; basically, it includes knowledge of Jesus Christ and a personal commitment to Him that permeates every aspect of daily living. This life of faith, which has its beginning with the birth of baptism, is subject to growth and change, and the teacher must be aware of the continual process of conversion that is going on so that he can help the student respond to God according to his age and capacity. The ultimate goal, of course, is a mature, adult, responsible relationship with God.

St. Paul relates that this life of "faith comes through hearing." In other words, there has to be some kind of a proclamation, an announcement, so that man may respond to God's message. And Paul goes on to mention in his writings some twenty times that it is the "mystery," which is to be proclaimed. The more that we study Paul, the more we realize how key this concept of the mystery of Christ is to the understanding of his entire thought. Father Hofinger has pointed out that "the mystery of Christ is the fundamental theme and unifying principle of all Christian religious instruction."¹

Yet, what is this mystery of Christ?

It is nothing less than the *transitus*, the passage from death to life, through the Cross to the resurrection, which was once for all accomplished in Christ. The Mystery, therefore, is an action; and it is an action which took place in the past and can never be repeated because it is perfect. The Mystery is the Cross of Jesus, the cross seen primarily as an accomplishment, fulfilling His own human history and the sacred history of God's People and, finally, the whole history of mankind which had been disrupted by the Fall but which, by the Cross, has been reconstituted and brought to an unalterably glorious conclusion by God Himself. The Mystery is, then, the Cross seen also in the fulness of its wonderful fecundity, that is, as including the resurrection of Christ, His ascension into glory, and, through the Christ Who has now Himself become *Pneuma*, life-giving Spirit, the radiance of all the wonderful gifts which He has given to man.²

In First Corinthians Paul writes: "But we speak the wisdom of God, mysterious, hidden, which God foreordained before the world into our glory, a wisdom which none of the rulers of this world has known, for had they known it, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory. But, as it is written, eye has not seen nor ear heard, nor has it entered into the heart

of man, what things God has prepared for those who love him. But to us God has revealed them through his Spirit. For the Spirit searches all things, even the deep things of God. For who among men knows the things of a man save the spirit of the man which is in him? Even so, the things of God no one knows but the Spirit of God. Now we have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit that is from God, that we may know the things that have been given us by God." (I Cor. 2, 7-12.)

Bouyer notes that Paul's thought is based on a passage in the second chapter of the Book of Daniel.

In both cases, the problem is that of the conduct of history. And the whole context in both cases presupposes an opposition between the way in which men, or created things in general, pretend to lead and make history, and the disconcerting and all-powerful way in which God does so, bringing their plans to nothing and accomplishing His Own unchanging plan. The Mystery is the clue to this secret way of God's, planned in His own "wisdom," and it is through His "revelation" to man that something of His secret way can be known. For, as St. Paul says in another passage, the wisdom of God looks like foolishness to the wise men of this world, but "the foolishness of God is wiser than men" . . . (I Cor. 1, 18).

To St. Paul, however, the great Mystery . . . in which all the partial mysteries are disclosed, in which the conflict of the two wisdoms reaches its climax, is the Cross of Jesus.³

Paul gradually deepens the content of the Mystery so as to include not only the victory of the resurrection gained through the Cross but also as being the key to the whole history of redeemed mankind and expressed in such terms as reconciliation of all men in Christ and the reestablishment of all things in Christ.

We may distinguish three elements in Paul's concept: 1) that from all eternity God had an overall plan of salvation for all mankind centered in His Son, Jesus Christ; this was something that was hidden in the depths of divine wisdom; 2) that this plan of salvation was revealed to man obscurely, gradually, progressively in the Old Testament, and fully, clearly, and completely in the New Testament with the coming of Christ; and 3) that this mystery or plan of salvation was proclaimed, communicated to man by the preaching of the Church, and that this phase is still going on now in 1964. Paul saw himself as part and parcel of this whole plan, and it is this vision that we must have both for ourselves and for our students—that we are involved in this same mystery.

Thus Paul has given us the foundation for an authentic theology of history; the mystery of Christ unfolds itself, works itself out, in history. Paul saw all of history in terms of the Incarnation. Everything that happened was leading to this event—God became man—and everything that has happened since then takes its meaning from what took place in the life of Christ. Here we have a member of our human family passing from this world of the flesh to the world of the Spirit by way of death, Resurrection, and Ascension, making it possible for every member of the human race to do exactly the same thing in and with Christ.

For Paul, then, the mystery of Christ was nothing less than what we call today salvation history. We may divide the unfolding of the mystery into various stages with the Paschal Mystery of Christ always seen as the heart and center of the whole mystery. For example: 1) Preparation for the coming

of Christ; 2) Realization of the mystery in Christ; 3) Continuation of the mystery in and through the church, which is Christ in the world today; 4) Final achievement of this entire plan with Christ's return.

Paul saw every aspect of Christian life in the context of the mystery of Christ. When he spoke of God, He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; the Church is the body of Christ; grace is living in Christ; morality is simply the conduct of a member of Christ.

The whole of reality, then, is seen by St. Paul in the light of Christ, as part of the mystery. Everything for him is "in Christ," an expression which recurs one hundred and sixty-four times in his letters. Christ is the fulness of the word of God (Col. 1, 25-29). He it is whom God gave us to be all our wisdom, our justification, our sanctification and our atonement (I Cor. 1, 30). He is the true likeness of the God we cannot see. In him and through him all things were created (Col. 1, 15-21).⁴

In each of these stages there is a basic pattern at work in the relationship between God and man. It is God who always takes the initiative, God acts first, He calls man, invites man, challenges man; in short; God loves man, and man is to respond freely "Yes" or "No," which implies acceptance or rejection of God's love. Moreover, the plan is in no way imposed upon man; it is not a straitjacket that man has to fit into, but this mystery of salvation actually unfolds itself in time through the free choices of man.

We shall concentrate on the second and third phases of the mystery—realization in Christ, and continuation in us.

The action by which God saves us took place in Christ; the communication of the divine reality to men was given in and through Christ; the saving acts of God in history are ordered to Christ and dependent upon what was realized in him. Christ, in what he was, in what he did, in what was realized in him, is the mystery in the basic sense; he is the divine reality present in history to save . . . the mystery is a divine saving action achieved in Christ.⁵

This saving action of the God who loves reaches its climax when Christ at the moment of his death in the fullness of his messianic consciousness and with perfect trust and confidence in his Father freely accepts and is obedient to the death of the Cross, a death that was swallowed up in the victory of the Resurrection.

It is in this act of complete openness and total surrender to His Father that Christ is fixed forever. He is, as it were, frozen in the unrepeatable moment of his death and glorification. He is forever, then, at the moment of his death to the world, and at the high point of his total giving of himself to the Father. He went to the Father in a moment of total renunciation of the world of the flesh, so that he could enter fully into the spirit of God, and thus become the life-giving spirit who pours himself out on the rest of mankind.

Our proclamation of the mystery must ever dispose and lead our students to that experience of the liturgy where that which we proclaim becomes a reality. As St. Paul put it: "As often as you shall eat this bread and drink the cup, you *proclaim* the death of the Lord, until He comes" (I. Cor. 11,25).

It is the inner attitude of Christ, that perduring act of love that is still operative in the actions of the risen Christ that becomes present in the liturgy. "To put on the mind of Christ," then, is to be identified with and enter into

the dynamic movement of Christ's love epitomized by the total submission of Himself to His Father's will.

To take part in the mystery sacramentally, then, involves serious moral implications—the mystery is to be relived in us.

St. Leo the Great in a famous passage stated that "what was visible in the life of Christ has passed over into the sacraments." I would like to add: And what has passed over into the sacraments (that is, Christ's death and resurrection) must again become visible in the life of Christ's members. Sacraments are signs. We who receive the sacraments must become living embodiments of the sacramental signs: living signs that can be seen and understood, loving signs that attract, because they convincingly proclaim to a love-starved world the irresistibly attractive love-surrender of Christ, until he comes.

This and only this, is living the liturgy. Only this is active and intelligent participation in the saving mystery of Christ.⁶

May I conclude by positing that this is the basic problem of teaching Religion. How does one communicate the mystery of this Person, Christ? And more than that, how does one communicate the love of this Person, which is the inner core and motivating force of this entire mystery, unless he himself is a sign whose life gives evidence that he has been touched by the mystery and that he is seriously involved in giving witness to the mystery as his own life unfolds in history.

FOOTNOTES

1. J. HOFINGER, *The Art of Teaching Christian Doctrine*, 11.
2. L. BOUYER, *Liturgical Piety*, 87-88.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 95.
4. D. GRASSO, "The Core of Missionary Preaching," in *Teaching All Nations*, 47.
5. C. DAVIS, *Liturgy and Doctrine*, 78-79.
6. G. DIEKMANN, "Sacramental Life—The Mystery Shared," *Worship*, October, 1963, pp. 597-98.

The Newman Apostolate and the High School Graduate

REV. EGBERT H. DONOVAN, O.S.B.

*Head Chaplain, Penn State Catholic Center, University Park,
Pennsylvania*

AFTER SOME SIXTY YEARS of struggle, the Newman Apostolate emerges today as a new frontier of the Church, a tribute to the prophetic vision of dedicated priests and laity. In 1893 a group of Catholic students at the University of Pennsylvania banded together in an organized effort to better their understanding and foster their practice of the faith. From this source arose a student movement which chose as its patron the great English scholar of Oxford, John Henry Cardinal Newman, and dedicated itself to the exemplification of his ideals.

In 1910 the germ of the movement was fed when St. Paul's Chapel at the University of Wisconsin and Newman Hall and Chapel at Berkeley, California, were built, both staffed with full-time chaplains. Here, the University parish, the Church on the campus addressing itself to the needs of the total university community, became reality. In 1915 the educational goal of the apostolate found roots when courses in the Bible offered at the University of Texas received credit. Four years later, in 1919, the same objective was realized at the University of Illinois when the state chartered a religious foundation as a "school of religion" and empowered it to offer credits transferable to the university. Other campuses followed, developing religious education programs with and without academic credit.

Today, Newmanism presents the Church to 913 of the 1258 non-religious campuses throughout the country. These programs engage thousands of Catholic students, joined by some 925 diocesan and religious priests and lay faculty members. Unfortunately, only 235—26 percent—of these chaplains are full-time. It is encouraging to note that more laity and, in a few instances, our valiant sisters have joined the staffs of Newman centers.

While the scene is ever bettering itself, although expanding too slowly for its anxious participants, a firm structure has developed while programming remains flexible. The most important characteristic of this structure became operative in April, 1962, with the establishment of the National Newman Apostolate as a full section of the NCWC Youth Department. Archbishop Hallinan of Atlanta became the first Episcopal moderator and continued until this year, when Bishop Malone of Youngstown succeeded him. At the same time, Father Charles Albright became coordinating secretary of the Apostolate's six constituent organizations, namely: the National Newman Club Federation, National Newman Association of Faculty and Staff, National Newman Chaplains Association, National Newman Alumni Association, National Newman Foundation, and the John Henry Cardinal Newman Honorary Society. With this establishment the Newman Apostolate is in the words of Monsignor Stevenson, secretary of the Youth Department, "a mandated form of Catholic action by which members cooperate with hierarchy in the apostolic work of the Church."

The goals of the apostolate were well expressed at the winter meeting in Laramie, Wyoming: 1) The intellectual and moral development of the Catholic; 2) Religious education of the Catholic; 3) Apostolic formation of the Catholic; 4) Contribution of the Catholic culture to the academic community; 5) Responsible participation of the Catholic in the academic and civic community. These goals are implemented first at the national level through those officers and members who ultimately serve the constituent elements of the apostolate.

It is interesting to note that the executive board recently renamed the annual national meeting of the Newman Apostolate. Formerly known as the National Newman Club Federation convention it now becomes the National Newman Congress. The change in name reflects a change in programming. One instance of this is the fact that business sessions of the six sections will be held early in the convention week to allow all members of the constituent elements to join in common discussion of the issues pertaining to the welfare of the apostolate.

Financed by the National Foundation, the National Chaplains Association instituted in 1961 the Newman Chaplain School at the University of Michigan under the direction of Monsignor John F. Bradley. In 1963 and

1964 this training school continues at the University of Minnesota directed by Reverend George Garrelts. The Newman Institutes of Catholic Thought, an excellent study week for chaplains—in fact, for any interested priest—are annually offered at St. Rose Priory, Dubuque, and Providence College, Rhode Island. Father Kevin O'Rourke, O.P., directs the Institutes.

The national organization becomes operative in regional provinces through its officers and standing committees. At this level, conventions, study weeks, and educational weekends acquaint student leaders with Christian concepts relevant to their intellectual pursuits and apostolic endeavors.

On the local level, the college or university campus, the Newman apostolate hopefully impacts the total university community. The student organization, unfortunately called the Newman Club, a title which ill describes its true nature and creates an erroneous impression of a purely social or fraternal group, remains a unit, operative under student leadership with advisement of a faculty moderator and a chaplain. In this way the student organization retains its autonomy in seeking its spiritual, intellectual, and social objectives. Where the student organization reaches into and places responsibility upon its own members in residence areas, fraternities, and independents, it serves as the nucleus of the campus parish and becomes a leaven in the student community; communication of ideas and events drift into dorm sessions, luncheon conversations, and innumerable contacts with chaplains result from this sort of student conversation.

Lay faculty members most generally and generously respond to student and chaplain requests for lectures and discussion sessions in public hall or residence areas.

It has been noted that programming within the Newman apostolate is flexible and must remain so due to the characteristics which locally differentiate campuses. The leadership, chaplains, faculty, and students must become fully cognizant of the influences of the various disciplines, the program of studies, the philosophy of counseling services, in order to meet Catholic students' need in their particular university. Consider a few of the differentiating factors.

Campuses vary in enrollment from 200 to 30,000 students—some are almost lost in the heart of a metropolitan area, others dominate small college towns. Some house 90 percent of the student population in university facilities; others lock their doors and say goodnight to a full commuting student body. Some campuses are attended by four or more full-time chaplains while others are grateful for a part-time over-assigned parish assistant.

Again, university and college religious policy vacillates from a gradually liberalizing policy to one of inert conservatism. From the liberal state university—such as Penn State—which welcomes chaplains of all faiths and provides, through private funds, a religious programming center with an inter-faith chapel, Blessed Sacrament chapel, with chaplains' offices, and common lounge and library facilities, with religious affairs offices in residence areas—or note the recent action of the Board of Supervisors of Louisiana State University who offered land on the campus to the dioceses of Alexandria for the construction of a chapel and a Newman center—to a secular campus which tolerates religious activities only at a distance, and quite a distance, from the center of the university life. One particular institution, at least a year ago, still refused to permit on the campus the posting of a notice of a Newman club meeting to be held off the campus.

Amid the diversity, recent developments indicate a new trend in religious awareness on campuses.

The dominant trends today in the return of religion as an academic discipline to the secular campus find expression in the establishment of departments of religion, and this with tax support. An increasing number of nondenominational universities invite Catholic theologians to join the faculty as full-time members, as at Western Michigan, and another, Yale, hires an outstanding lay canon lawyer. Many other universities *lament* the shortage of available competent Catholic candidates for such faculty positions open to them in the departments of religion.

Enjoying less acceptance is the older pattern in which religious courses offered by denominational-supported centers or foundations receive university credit.

If the recent trend in the establishment of religion departments continues, the committed intellectual life of the Church must become viable from within the Newman apostolate at all levels, student, faculty, and chaplains.

While always presupposing a continuing identification of the student with the sources of divine life, the crucial impact of the secular campus with the student centers in the integration of knowledge. It is precisely here, that the apostolate, chaplain and the student face together the real task of ever relating deepening theological truths to new evidences in the intellectual, moral, and social orders which emerge in his daily experiences.

The secular university must remain uncommitted to any theological position. It does, in general, preserve always the right of the "up-right conscience." In a uniquely American fashion, the university recognizes the relationship of religious studies to the transmission of cultural knowledge and the development of the person who impacts the new social patterns daily emerging from the ever receding frontiers of secular learning. This concept, operative in the liberalizing university milieu will, I think, continue the establishment of departments of religion as well as a closer coordination and cooperation of religious leadership with university instructional and personnel staffs. The integration at the intellectual level can only be achieved from within the Newman apostolate, from within Catholicism itself, "Credo ut intelligam," as Augustine epitomizes it.

These factors do emphasize the need for concerted effort on the part of all religious-minded citizens to promote the opportunity for presentation of religious and moral values to young students, and this through the intellectual processes. The hope of supplanting the void of secularism lies in its confrontation with Judaeo-Christian values.

The realistic impact of this need for Catholics becomes more evident when one considers that one decade of time will witness an increase of Catholic students in Catholic colleges from 309,000 in 1960 to 473,000 in 1970 while the number of Catholic students on the secular campuses will leap from 519,000 to 1,136,000.

If one dare look to 1985, be mindful that the National Newman office estimates an increase of Catholics on the Catholic campus from 309,000 in 1960 to 536,000 in 1985 while the Catholic on the secular campus will leap from 519,000 in 1960 to 2,360,000 in 1985.

What significance have these facts for you, leaders of Catholic education? Archbishop Hallinan recognized these facts when he defined Catholic education at the 1963 NCEA meeting: "I offer a final suggestion—that we broaden the whole definition of Catholic higher education, that we seriously consider

it in terms of every Catholic student, whether he be in our Catholic institutions, with which we are singularly blessed, or in those secular institutions, public or private."

If we consider Catholic higher education in terms of every Catholic student, whether he be on a Catholic or secular campus, then one may ask, "What can Catholic education contribute to national needs?" Indeed, to review for you the current literature descriptive of the void in the university values that leaves the student unsatisfied in his search for an integrating principle, a meaning in life, an ultimate concern, would only repeat that which is already well recognized. To cite only a few, Professor Mowrer in his book *Crisis in Religion and Psychiatry* laments the destruction of students' belief arising from the mutual efforts of religion and science to destroy faith in each other.

A very recent article entitled "Is God Leaving the Campus?" by James R. Defoe, describes the neglect of all churches in their ministry to college students on secular campuses. He writes:

American churches contribute millions to send missionaries and money to the Congo, New Guinea, South America, Israel. But by a strange combination of historical accidents, they are simultaneously neglecting the three and one-half million future leaders of their own nation, in the 1,258 secular or non-religious colleges and universities of the country. To compound the irony, *this baffling neglect comes at a time when a new interest in religious values and ideas* is sweeping the campuses of America.

Certainly, a most interesting study is that of Father Richard Butler, O.P., National Newman Chaplain. His comprehensive review of the campus scene engendered this encouraging observation: "I am convinced that the role of religion in higher education is in transition—I do believe that the future promises a proper place for God on the secular campus." (*God on the Secular Campus*, p. 179.)

Now is the time for the Church in America to act with vigor in support of this felt need on the secular campus for mature discussion of ultimate concerns and moral values. To delay an enthusiastic, in fact a crash program, to resolve this need is to abandon an open, fertile field to the sower of ideas destructive of the Judaeo-Christian values. Catholicism can not face this problem alone. The cooperative effort of all religious communities will achieve significant results.

For this concern, we must recall the spirit of Vatican II, and under its directions, guided by the wishes of our bishops, join with all religious forces to create what Father Greely calls the "religious campus," one that enrolls better than 50 percent religiously committed students. This kind of environment nurtures the religious concern of all in the university community.

Catholic education must encourage and produce laity competent to fill the demands of the secular university; this need constitutes one of our greatest weaknesses in the educational diaspora of today. It seems to me that our prayers for religious and priestly vocations should be broadened to include the consecration of the baptized, confirmed layman to the teaching apostolate of the Church on the highest intellectual levels, the area most devoid of his impact. This dedication needs to be incorporated into the vision of the high school graduate of either sex. One can wisely include the field of

clinical psychology in the same notion of service. The realization of this objective would enable Catholic education to fill a national need.

May consideration be given to two aspects of the Newman apostolate and the high school graduate? How do graduates evaluate Catholic high school experiences after six months on the secular campus? And what ideas do they meet and in what manner?

The following five comments were written by two groups of freshmen working independently, yet agreeing in their expression.

1. The graduate should receive a preparation for a *creative* rather than a *negative reaction* to the secular environment. It should be stressed that the secular campus is an *apostolate*, in desperate need of exemplary Catholic students. The limitless opportunities for the student to do good and to grow in his faith must be made known.

2. Develop an atmosphere of tolerance and openmindedness.—This should extend both to a working knowledge of other faiths and to an awareness of non-Christian philosophies. Knowledge of faiths other than Catholicism would enable the student to appreciate the good they hold and to see his own faith in the context of all faiths. And unless the student understands the philosophies he will encounter, he will not be able to offer any logical refutation of them in favor of Catholicism.

3. A well-directed study of apologetics.—This study, as I know from experience, can help the student to reach a personal conviction concerning the tenets of his faith. By an intelligent, honest appraisal of all sides of a question, he is led to a conviction based on a rational as well as a supernatural process. He is then better prepared to defend and to clarify his faith when, as will often happen, the need arises. But the attitude arising from this study should be one of love and a deep desire to share the most wonderful gift of God to man, rather than a belligerent, defensive attitude.

4. Develop a personal, individual relationship with God.—The idea of the priesthood of the laity should be encouraged. Emphasis on the liturgy as a dynamic, growing force, and on the student as participant rather than spectator will help him to incorporate his faith deeply into his personal, daily life. His religion must become for the student an integral part of the attitude toward life which he is forming during his high school years. Unless the student is shown a vital, living faith, a faith of which he is an active part, his religion will be an applied thing, easily dislodged when it is shaken.

5. Be aware of the brotherhood of men.—Most important, the student must be led to see himself not only as a member of the Catholic Church, but as a member of the human family, with a responsibility toward his fellowman. All religions are, after all, fighting the common enemy of a godless civilization, and a Catholic who hinders them because of pettiness and narrow-mindedness is doing nothing for the cause of Christ. The late Pope John was very much aware of the growing need for unity among faiths, and his work in this direction and deep love for all men should be the model for the Catholic student confronted with learning and growing in a secular environment. So speak your students.

Our second question: What ideas do they meet and in what manner? Perhaps two examples will suffice: The reading in freshman literature and the freshman course in philosophy. These courses are common experience for all freshmen in the college of liberal arts, the university's largest college.

Readings in English include: *Toward Liberal Education*, selected essays; *The Prince* and *The Discourses*, Machiavelli; Plato; *Crime and Punishment*, Dostoevski; *Candide*, Voltaire; *Othello*, Shakespeare; Sophocles; *Three Treban Plays*, Banks; *The Book of Job*; *Huck Finn*, Twain; Franklin's Autobiography; *The Great Gatsby*, Fitzgerald; Selected Tales and Poems, Melville; Thoreau; *Education of Henry Adams*, Adams; Selected Tales and Sketches, Hawthorne; *All the King's Men*, Warren.

In philosophy, first term reading, include *The Works of Thomas Aquinas*, Aquinas; *Dialogues on Natural Religion*, Hume; *Why I Am Not a Christian*, Russell; Aristotle's *Ethics*; Existentialism, Sartre; Dostoevski.

Sharp concern arises in the fearful freshman when these ideas are presented in the classroom. He finds difficulty in discerning between the presentation and required grasp of an idea and the acceptance of the idea as his own commitment. Rarely does the student meet a classroom situation which forces his unwilling acceptance of any idea contrary to faith. Perhaps an examination in philosophy will exemplify the usual analytical and descriptive classroom approach. This particular exam followed the readings listed in the philosophy course:

1. Consider some concrete situation in which we are faced with a choice either in public or in private life. Analyze the situation as you believe either Aristotle or Aquinas would. If you find such an analysis incorrect or inadequate, indicate why, briefly.
2. Consider some concrete situation in which self-deception, in Sartre's sense, is an important element. Analyze the situation as you believe Sartre would. If you find such an analysis inadequate or incorrect, indicate why, briefly.
3. Consider some argument for the existence of God. Analyze the argument making clear its relation to God's nature and give Philo's criticism of it. If you find such criticism inadequate or incorrect, indicate why, briefly.
4. Compare and contrast the views of two of our authors on the nature of the self. You may pay more attention to one author than to the other. *Suggestions:* What sorts of difficulties (or opportunities) are peculiar to the human situation? Can (and how can) we speak of man as free? How should (or does) a man respond to other men? (You need not accept any of these suggestions.)
5. Consider whether it makes any difference to man if God does or does not exist. Discuss in terms of the views of at least two of our authors. Alternatively consider whether it makes any difference to man if he believes that God does or does not exist.
6. If you don't like any of these questions ask some other question involving at least two of our authors and answer it. Be sure to indicate what the question is. This sort of critical analysis characterizes most learning experiences.

The students' contemporary grasp of the traditional animosity between public and private education is purely historical. For them, this battle is dead, the soldiers have gone home. To them, the dual education system confirms the pluralism of democratic America and enhances the fruitful survival of each.

Mutually, the abundant resources of each must contribute generously of the best within their respective areas to American cultural needs. In this regard when an otherwise qualified student submits an application to a secular university, please avoid a negative recommendation solely because of your disapproval of the secular environment.

This spring, Penn State processed 45,000 applications, the usual factors in the admissions formula being weighed by computer. These computers do not understand negative recommendations, so they are simply ignored. Such recommendations only embarrass parents and students and amuse the counseling staff.

The Catholic task is otherwise. The instantaneousness of contemporary change as science probes the microscopic elementary particles of nature and magnifies the astronomical entities of outer space, as technology substitutes for human energy through electronic automation and computers, as cybernetics, the science of control mechanisms manifests itself in neurology, psychology, and many other disciplines, as human engineering aims to redesign the genetic components of the human cell—such changes demand our attention and allow for no time lag in our accommodation to the consequent social effects.

Timorous circumvention of these ideas stamps with callow immaturity our whole approach to—rather, evasion of—these challenges. Any protective attempt under the guise of religion to build a wall of exclusion against the impact of these forces and ideas traduces the very foundations of our belief. It discredits religion in the eyes of thinking men.

Surely, the strength of a divinely revealed religion consists, among other things, in its capacity to welcome these phenomena and find for them their appropriate places in the hierarchy of values and categories of being emanating from the inscrutable but all-comprehending mind of God.

In lumine tuo, videbimus lumen.

It is in the divine light that our minds see the light.

Staff Utilization—Implications for Administrators

PHILIP R. PITRUZZELLO

Superintendent of Schools, Ridgefield, Connecticut

IN AN ADDRESS delivered at the convention of the National School Boards Association in Denver, Daniel Davies referred to the administrator as "the man-in-the-middle. . . buffeted by a surrounding field of forces which increases in intensity every year. No other country in the world subjects its local educational administrators to such pressures—or offers them such opportunities."

Please note the last words of this quotation. Davies' statement was no play for sympathy. It was not a plea to treat administrators gently. My understanding of his remarks is that the administrator is in the middle of things and inevitably so. Not much will happen unless he understands the forces which interact in society. Not much will happen unless he consciously works to create a harmonious arrangement under which he can be effective as a change agent.

A basic requirement for change is that the administrator recognize the need for change. If we review the progress of mankind throughout history it becomes clear that although there has been steady progress it has not been

at a uniform rate. There have been periods of acceleration and then comparative inaction.

Sociologists have analyzed this phenomenon and they tell us that society is most comfortable when all forces so counterbalance each other that change is neither desirable nor necessary. But they also point out, unfortunately, that this condition is rare and, perhaps, only theoretically possible. The fact is, there is always disequilibrium with only a difference in degree. The greater the imbalance the more urgent the need for change, and vice versa.

But the situation is not hopeless; on the contrary, these are exciting times in education. If one develops a model of an improved school and works toward achieving this ideal, or even if one simply tries promising practices in the hope that through careful evaluation a concept of a better school can be developed, innovations can be made. As long as there is a searching and a challenging of folklore, carefully selected and desirable changes can take place.

If we assume that conditions are favorable for introducing innovations, that the administrator is convinced of the need for improving, and that the public is disposed to accept change, how do we approach comprehensive school improvement? I find it helpful to analyze what makes up a school. There are at least five basic elements that we are referring to when we talk about schools.

1. *The Curriculum.* Curriculum is the first of these and it constitutes the substance of learning. It extends on a vertical axis from the beginning years in school through college and graduate school. To an unprecedented degree, and for some unexplained reason, the great scholars in all of the disciplines have been turning their attention to curriculum recently. No longer are we limited to our own, often inept, efforts in curriculum revision.

Under Edward Begle, the School Mathematics Study Group (SMSG) has developed sample courses, textbooks, and associated materials for grades 4-12. These materials are of such quality that local schools truly interested in improving instruction cannot responsibly ignore the work of this group or of a group such as the Research Council of Greater Cleveland, for that matter.

Similarly, the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) has up-dated the teaching of biology so that no respectable school can be satisfied with a nature-study, leaf-collection offering any longer. The superior materials commonly known as the Yellow, Blue, and Green Versions have revolutionized the teaching of biology and are based on a comprehensive approach which even includes the retraining of teachers. Joseph Schwab, largely responsible for the teacher's handbook, provides a marvelously usable volume giving background, explanations, and aid.

The Physical Science Study Committee at M.I.T. and the Chemical Bond Approach Project are two more examples of attempts by scholars to become actively involved in curriculum development. There are rumblings in the humanities also. Projects in the field of English and social studies are under way. In general, there appears to be greater emphasis in helping the student learn not only how to acquire knowledge, but how to test knowledge and how to create new knowledge.

Reconstruction of curriculum and methods of instruction which takes into account both the structure of knowledge and the fruitful modes of inquiry within each discipline is the order of the day. But curriculum alone, while it is the fabric of the school, is not all we mean when we say school.

2. *The Pupil.* In addition to the substance of that which we learn, we need someone who is to learn. A second element is the pupil. We have not been as bold, as imaginative, as innovative as we could be in reconciling what we already know about how children learn with actual practice. There is, of course, a great void in the measurement of effectiveness of education and a great deal we do not understand about how pupils learn.

3. *The School Building.* Then, of course, the school, as we know it, means a place in which to learn. So we design spaces to house the school. Winston Churchill once observed that we shape our buildings and thereafter they shape us. Is there any doubt in your mind as to the arrangement of spaces you will find in most schools no matter how different the facade? You will not have to look far, after entering, for the administrative suite. You know that the inevitable long corridor with doors at regular intervals will be there. Behind those doors are classrooms, essentially alike, regardless of the kind of learning that is supposed to take place.

4. *The Use of Time.* We are all familiar with the fourth element: the way we treat time in schools. We start with five days a week, six hours a day, divided into six, seven, or possibly eight uniform periods. Then we fit the instructional program to the time schedule. Instruction is chopped up into irrational bits until the meaning, the unity, and the essence of the particular discipline is destroyed.

5. *The Staff.* The fifth element is people who help learning take place—the staff. Traditionally, we assume that “staff” means those people who have met certification requirements and are employed to teach and work with pupils. I have difficulty with this narrow definition of staff because the function of teaching involves a variety of behavior; in some of this behavior others are as competent and perhaps more competent than teachers. If we are not to overlook all of the human resources which can make a contribution to learning, we must broaden our definition of staff. We must focus on the kinds of personnel who can help students learn best. We must be willing to consider a variety of resource people—subject specialists, aides, clerks, instructional assistants, lay readers, student interns, or what have you, who can make a contribution to helping students learn. Certainly, all this must be coordinated, it must be in concert with the teacher, but although the teacher may be the concert master, he should not try to be the whole orchestra. This is probably the major question facing the teaching profession today.

Types of Staff Utilization Projects

Despite many differences, I don't think it is contradictory to say that most staff utilization projects fall into three broad categories. The most common is one of three teachers of equal status with no aides. The purpose is conservation of teacher-time whenever possible. This time is generally reinvested in better and more extension planning. Invariably the results are more extensive use of technological aids and a pooling of the teaching abilities of the team. Grouping is flexible within certain limits but all vary class size for certain activities. Large group instruction is possible and usually practiced to some extent. The large group is divided into suitable subgroups.

The second most common type is slightly more sophisticated. It uses a team of three or four. There is often some interest in fusion of content areas such as social studies and English. A large time-block is assigned and teachers decide how to use this time. Specialization of tasks receives more

attention and more kinds of personnel are introduced into the team. Time to plan and special facilities for large-group instruction place more emphasis on technology than is usually possible.

A third category involves a general reorganization of the secondary program. The entire school is geared for team teaching. Large groups are generated in all of the curriculum offerings. The purpose becomes more comprehensive. There are far more objectives, such as reorganizing course content or complete flexibility of class size. There is much more apt to be use of uncertified personnel for non-professional tasks. For example, one school is planning to organize as follows: a certified teacher presenter, for 15 hours of teaching; a certified teacher instructor for 30 hours of teaching; an instructional aide with a B.A. degree, for 40 hours of non-teaching duties; a general aide with a high school diploma, for 40 hours of work in the cafeteria and study hall; and a clerk with a high school diploma for 40 hours of clerical work. The intention in this school is to employ technology to the maximum: teaching machines, closed-circuit television, and the like. They are going to schedule students so that they need not always be under direct supervision of a certified teacher.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

I do not want to leave you with the impression that questions and problems do not arise. They do, and they must be dealt with in a permissive climate which will allow free and open discussion. This should not discourage or threaten the administrator who may be impatient to get under way or fears delegation of responsibility. He must realize that teachers have as great a stake in this as he has, perhaps greater. He should have confidence that teachers will be open-minded and will arrive at sound conclusions—just as I have seen them do time and time again.

What questions arise which bear on the administrator and his role? Will the administrator's role change? It seems to me that it will. In effect, when a group of teachers is given the responsibility to vary the length of time a class meets, the size of classes, the arrangement of spaces, the grouping of students, the administrator no longer decides these things. This delegation of responsibilities traditionally performed by administrators should not be threatening, though I know it may be difficult for some to accept.

Viewed positively, the principal as a supervisor and instructional leader can hope to have a real impact on the quality of instruction by sitting in on planning sessions. Those who say they do not have time to supervise can now sit with groups of teachers and affect the kind of instruction youngsters will get before it takes place. This planning with teachers is a real breakthrough over the rather sterile concept of supervision which prevails today. The present pattern involves observation, conferences in which suggestions for improvement are made for follow-up and correction. The pitfalls are that poor instruction and practices have already taken place and that follow-up is not always effective.

I am not, by the way, suggesting that the administrator not exercise a role in determining the organization for instruction. Voluntary associations of teachers are desirable and, perhaps, teams at the initial stage should include only those who are willing to try a new arrangement. I cannot agree, however, that administrators should allow teams to form purely by chance. Once teachers indicate a willingness to work in teams, it would be a gross

neglect of responsibility if administrators did not play an active role in forming specific combinations.

Basic changes in the organization of schools—in the way we arrange curriculum, pupils, space, time, and staff—can facilitate good use of the specialized talents of teachers and apply imagination and ingenuity in motivating learning and providing resources for its effective pursuit. My observation in over two hundred schools indicates that a new concept of what is learned, the arrangement of the environment for learning, how we teach, and who teaches is taking place.

It is no exaggeration to say that as a result, secondary education has changed and is at the same time ready for more change; it is in ferment, and highly susceptible to innovation. If nothing else were true, this is a formidable achievement in itself. Unless the administrator recognizes his responsibility as a change agent; unless he is keyed to a twentieth-century concept of his role, secondary schools will remain as they were in my first year in teaching when the only change permitted throughout the year was to change the clocks when we went on daylight-saving time.

Use of Community Resources and Personnel

REV. THOMAS J. PETERMAN

Principal, Holy Cross High School, Dover, Delaware

THE SECOND SUBTOPIC under this meeting's main theme, "Utilization of Staff and Facilities," directs our attention to the maximum advisable use of technical resources and knowledgeable personnel in the community. It is concerned with professional and technically trained people from science and industry who are not professionally attached to the school system, and who, gratis or for nominal expense, make themselves available to the school, to augment the program, to enrich the instruction, to update, give diversification and practical application to the school's curriculum.

We intend to discuss the advisable use of *community* resources and personnel. The community may be local (the city or the parish), statewide, regional or national, since a wealth of resource is offered from all of these levels. Not all that is said of our community of Dover, Delaware, will apply to your community. But we have been asked to speak here of our school in Dover.

Dover is the capital of the state, a rapidly growing but small town of 11,000 citizens. Delaware itself is a small state, the Diamond State, small but precious (in our sight at least), lying in the Delaware Valley, an area of growing industry, where already are located DuPont, Hercules, and Atlas industrial centers. In Dover itself are the Air Force Base, International Playtex, Green Giant, and now General Foods—making Dover the "jello capital" of the World, and that is no small boast!

Our High School, with its present enrollment of 180 students, is growing with the Catholic community. Our school is staffed by two diocesan priests (myself and another), by four Felician sisters, and four qualified lay

teachers. As in most high schools, courses are offered in the three areas—academic, business, and general. There are the four classes—senior, junior, sophomore, and freshman, one section of each. We have two well-equipped laboratories. We achieve a high level of results on national tests. While our school is not an extraordinary school, it was suggested that we present a detailed description of our program at Holy Cross High School, in which we include men from industry and the professions to supplement course offerings to our students.

This presentation will be concerned with the use of these resources both within school hours and outside of school hours.

Although we include a number of community resources and personnel in our program, by far the most notable is our Holy Cross Science Club, a group that meets voluntarily—that is, by no faculty compulsion—every Wednesday evening in the rooms and labs of the high school, under the direction of Sister Mary Rose of our faculty, and Dr. Emil Sammak of the Knights of Columbus, an interested layman of the parish, co-moderators. It is organized as a club, and not a class—that is, no examinations are given, nor any mark or credit given for work done.

There are elected student officers who check the attendance, collect the nominal dues, and see that order is kept. We have been fortunate here, because only very interested students would give up outside-of-school time nearly every Wednesday evening, from 6:30 till 9:00, with knowledge (seemingly) as their only reward.

The membership of the club numbers about thirty, and the regular attendance is about that number. Because the program has been exciting, good attendance has been no problem.

The Science Club is composed of five groups or divisions: chemistry, meteorology, biology, physics, and astronomy. Skilled and capable men of the community direct the activities of each group. Dr. Clayton Bowe of International Playtex, the chemist group; Lieutenant Paul Whitney of Dover Air Force Base, the meteorology group; Mr. George L. Schmidt of International Playtex, the astronomy group; Dr. Charles Allen, a local physician, the biology group; and Mr. Herbert Castellani of International Playtex, the physics group. These men and other prominent men whom they contact, highlight each meeting with informative lectures and demonstrations. Projects are planned week after week. There are many advantages to an outsider speaking. Student interest is stimulated, and you can see from some of the projects that I will describe that the quality of the work was equivalent to a classroom session, or superior, because of the training and experience of the lecturers.

For instance, Dr. Allen and his biology group last year dissected the eye of a cow and studied the lens of the eye. At another meeting, Dr. Allen brought a diseased and cancerous human heart preserved in formaldehyde, and the students studied it as the doctor dissected it. His learning and experience were invaluable in answering the students' questions. The doctor pointed out the cause of the person's death as had been shown in the autopsy. This group studied various types of cancer from samples which Dr. Allen brought in. There was another experiment, with drosophila, or fruit flies, conducted under Dr. Allen, to study genes and types reproduced. But the highlight of this group's activities was the examination of a five-month-old human fetus, the result of a miscarriage, which Dr. Allen dissected and, step-by-step, demonstrated to the students. Wearing gloves, the students examined the parts under the doctor's supervision. The head of the child had been enlarged. The

students were impressed when the doctor pointed out how nature provides for itself, rejecting, in so many cases, a malformed fetus.

Lieutenant Whitney, the meteorologist from the Air Force Base Weather Station, taught his group how to read weather maps, and actually how to chart them. Week after week, this group brought weather maps they charted after listening to the weather forecasts on television. They learned a great deal from the books and instruments which Lieutenant Whitney made available to them.

The astronomy group, under Mr. Schmidt, started the construction of a telescope, grinding the glass themselves and shaping the other parts. A student member had made his own telescope, which he demonstrated, and through the weeks the group studied the heavens according to the seasons of the year. One noteworthy accomplishment was a set of color photos taken of the sun.

The physics group, under the direction of Mr. Castellani, became engrossed in the building of a solar battery. A solar battery is made available by Bell Telephone Company in kit form, which includes simple directions.

We do not intend to bore you with all these details unnecessarily, but the details hopefully will make this talk practical and convincing that there is a wealth of talent and resource from interested and capable persons of almost every community.

This year the Science Club members, feeling that they were "missing out" by dividing into groups, have met together as one group, and the directors and guest lecturers have scheduled talks and demonstrations for different Wednesdays so that all could profit from them.

In addition to the last year's speakers, who are serving us again this year, we have added a number of others. Mr. Franklin Hurst, an electronics instructor at Dover Air Force Base, and Mr. Ernest McGhee, electronics instructor, recently retired from the Air Force and living in the Dover community, are currently giving a series of lectures and demonstrations on electricity and basic electronics. Dr. Schwarz, of the Hercules Research Center, gave a stimulating talk on space technology, employing his own charts and treating the subject in depth. This talk dealt with the problems of getting a space vehicle out of the earth's atmosphere and to the moon or another planet. His talk is usually given to college students, and he mentioned that he was withholding some formulas because of their advanced complication. He proceeded by questions addressed to the students, ascertaining as he went along how much high school students knew and whether they were keeping up with him. He brought a demonstration board with him, which showed visually how a satellite travels in space forming an ellipse, something most students know only as an oval on graph paper.

Arrangements for Dr. Schwarz's talk were made by Dr. Robert Osborne, of Hercules Research Center, who serves in the capacity of regional counselor in physics for Delaware. Dr. Osborne has made arrangements for two further speakers between now and June. Incidentally, Dr. Osborne has been so impressed by the Science Club that he has given us a great deal of publicity among his colleagues.

Another talk and demonstration was given to the Science Club by Lieutenant Vernon Waller of the Delaware State Police on "Scientific Crime Detection." Lieutenant Waller supplemented his talk with a demonstration of the polygraph, colloquially known as the lie detector.

The Science Club this year made a tour of the Kent General Hospital

laboratory—the serology lab. The technician was on hand, at the request of Dr. Allen, gladly giving up his own free time to run several blood tests to determine blood type, and to show how things are done in the hospital lab. They also observed a patient being X-rayed on an X ray-TV setup. The boys sat in as the doctor talked. The fluoroscoping was filmed so that later the boys could see what the eye had missed and the film caught.

The Science Club was also conducted on a tour of International Latex plants and laboratories, and on another tour of Dr. Pollack's laboratory in Dover.

The members of the club have had the opportunity, through their professional directors, to view films which are usually set aside for the medical profession. For instance, three different films were viewed on heart surgery, and the doctor was there to answer questions which an ordinary instructor would not have been as qualified to answer.

Several films on chemical reactions were brought to the club by Dr. Sammak of International Latex. Mr. Edward Hart, State Supervisor of Science, has paid numerous visits to our Science Club and has shown interest and given advice. On one occasion he gave a demonstration lecture on radiation in leaves, and made available for our use in class a complete unit for studying radiation, namely, a good (that is, expensive) Geiger counter, not a classroom model, several radiation sources, a closed chamber and various accessories. These items will be made available to us again this year. He also has been most helpful when our science departments were being set up by advising on equipment and book purchases, and various details connected with a full-scale project such as ours.

Besides the Science Club, our school has sponsored Future Nurses and Future Teachers Clubs. These groups have been less active, but have had speakers at their meetings, which are held outside of school hours.

Now, let us turn our attention to the program *within school hours*, and see the instances where we, at Holy Cross, have made use of available community resources to supplement and boost our curriculum. Admittedly, we have not taken advantage of every opportunity available, and perhaps that is advisable, but here are some samples.

We will speak first of the physical sciences. Last year, the Delaware State Forestry, upon request, sent a man to speak to our General Science class on soil erosion, forestry, soil acidity, and pertaining subjects. The Water Pollution Bureau sent a lecturer to the same class to speak on the local water supply, water contamination count, how it is obtained, how to reduce it, and related topics. Each lecturer brought out scientific principles, yet focused on local problems, speaking of things with which the boys and girls were familiar, giving the talks a very practical slant.

Last year, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, from Washington, D.C., presented an assembly to the entire school with an elaborate and fascinating demonstration. Some of you may be familiar with the space-mobile units which NASA makes available in schools throughout the country. This year, the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies presented a demonstration followed by classroom discussion, on the atom and the uses of nuclear power. The Bell Telephone Company has presented assemblies on sound, color, and beauty, to the school at different times.

Besides lectures and demonstrators, we have availed ourselves of the vast film libraries offered to us by Shell Oil, Bell Telephone, United States Steel

and Dow Chemical. The list of suppliers of free films is unlimited. These free films and filmstrips are listed in several catalogues which are available. When requested in advance, we had no difficulty obtaining them for the time when they were needed. The Manufacturing Chemists Association puts out a number of free and useful films, available upon request.

The University of Delaware, in September, 1963, initiated a visiting-lecturer program for mathematics, conducting lectures and discussion groups for high schools.

In the field of student guidance, we have availed ourselves of films from the Delaware Mental Health Society. Here we are not concerned with the mentally disturbed. There is an abundance of films on adolescence, social growth and adjustment, which were helpful to teen-agers who are so impressionable, and also to the teachers who viewed them to understand teenage problems.

A pharmacist talked to the seniors and juniors on pharmaceutical careers, illustrating his lecture with an interesting film. In religion courses we have had several laymen talking enthusiastically of lay organizations in the parish, the diocese, the country. In our Problems of American Democracy course we had a lecturer who spoke on the physically handicapped in our society—Miss Mary Ann Wright, a very charming and successful business woman, physically handicapped from birth, and foundress of the Mancus Club for the handicapped in Wilmington. A rabbi and two Protestant clergymen from the community have talked at our Brotherhood Assemblies.

Mr. Enterline, of a local mortgage and loan company, has spoken to our economics and business classes. Mr. Nicholson, a retired band conductor, has worked with the boys and girls in the school to form a fine Drum and Bugle Corps. A number of persons in the Community Players (a drama group) have helped in the coaching of plays. A dance teacher has been regularly willing to give up her free time to teach the dance routines for play intermissions and for musicales themselves.

We could enumerate many other instances, but we feel this is sufficient to give an idea of what we are doing at Holy Cross.

So let us conclude this paper with some practical recommendations. There are five that have occurred to me:

1. *That the speakers gear their talks to the level of youth.* The lecturers that we have had have shown a marvelous ability to "reach" the teen-agers asking questions as they lectured, and judging by the response whether most of the group were getting what they were illustrating. The magic of science was shown in a simple way—not in unnecessary technical terms, or if some difficult terms were necessary, explaining them in a clear and interesting way. Some school administrators may hesitate to invite outside professional speakers, fearing that they will talk above the high school level, and only confuse the students. Perhaps we have been fortunate in the persons who have come, but all seem to have "gotten through" to the students.

2. *That there be not too many lectures or demonstrations.* A teacher would make a mistake to "flood" the course with outside speakers, neglecting the substance and the continuity of the course. Specialties highlight a course and give it new interest but should never supplant the course or the instructor. It is advisable to have a great number of lecturers outside of school hours—many are available only in the evening—and a prudent number within the regular class periods.

3. *That the person invited be capable and in some aspect a specialist.* A guest lecturer should be qualified to give a little more than the teacher can give in a particular area only because the teacher has a more general knowledge of the subject.

4. *That the lectures and demonstrations be correlated with school courses.* A deeper investigation of the subject, a new slant, a more technical or up-to-date approach, more than the school itself can provide, are the gains to be had from personnel of science and industry. Extraneous and novel talks within or outside the class time are not what we have in mind in recommending a program of guest speakers.

5. *Where to get them? and How to keep them?* We have found professional men very willing and available. They ask only to be given notice in advance. Perhaps Dr. Sammak's abiding interest has made our efforts successful, more than any other factor. He is the Kent County coordinator for the Visiting Scientists Program for the Delaware Academy of Science, a program geared to encourage student interest in the sciences by bringing students and teachers into closer contact with distinguished scientists in industry and government. Through this program, speakers may be obtained on such topics as: Fiber Spinning Principles, Analytical Chemistry, Metallurgy, Crystals, Industry Requirements for Scientists, Opportunities for Scientists in Industry, Space Mechanics, Rocketry, Automation, Electronics, and so forth.

Professional men, such as are the directors of our Science Club, will be available when they know they are wanted. There must be interest and respect shown by the faculty and students in their position and knowledge. The sacrifice of time they make must always be worth while. This is how to keep them. They have a genuine interest in what high school students are learning, and in having a part in their formation. They also are very interested in attracting young people to their profession. Little "human" recognitions, such as a picture or write-up in the yearbook, "socials" are important at different times for them, such as a Christmas party; but the chief drawing force is that it is worth their while. The speakers of this year are anxious to come again next year. The Science Club and activities are talked about, and the enthusiasm spreads.

We submit these practices at our high school not to parade bizarre or novel educational practices, but to extend our perceptions to other Catholics so as to bring about the highest possible type of education for the students attending our schools. These are examples of what a principal and staff members can do toward this end. We are all dedicated to devising more promising ways of providing high quality education and ever realistically to evaluate the results of our efforts.

Advanced Summer Schools for High School Students: The Program at Clayton High School, St. Louis (Summary)

REV. GERALD R. SHEAHAN, S.J.

Principal, Saint Louis University High School

THE AIM OF MY REMARKS is to promote discussion, not merely to inform. Thus, I shall raise and only partially answer several questions about advanced summer schools.

Such schools offer advanced courses to advanced students. The courses should supplement rather than duplicate regular high school courses, and they should be taught in seminar fashion. They should be given to small groups of students gifted in both ability and ambition.

There are hundreds of such schools throughout the nation. I am most acquainted with the Mark Twain Summer Institute in St. Louis. It is open to gifted students from all public, private, and denominational schools. Tuition is \$60 and help is given to those who need it. Some of the courses offered are Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Latin, American history, advanced science and mathematics, political philosophy, and so forth. Four hundred students are admitted, and the median IQ is about 135.

In general, the student reaction to the Mark Twain Institute is very favorable. However, several problems have arisen within our own student body about taking courses there. The problems are raised by some of our best students and hinge around the ideas of loss of summer income, "too much of the same thing," loss of a chance of develop oneself socially and in fields of leadership.

One possible answer to these problems is an evening reading seminar that would meet two or three nights per week with group discussion of books read. This timing would allow the holding of jobs or making of trips. Attendance and timing would be flexible and the structure and atmosphere would be considerably different from the usual classroom routine.

Educational TV—What One School Is Doing With Closed-Circuit Television

REV. ANTHONY J. DOUGHERTY, O.S.F.S.

Salesianum School, Wilmington, Delaware

EDUCATIONAL TV means many things to many people. You have open-circuit ETV and closed-circuit TV, and closed-circuit can be on the Hagerstown style with twenty-five or fifty schools on the circuit, or it can mean a TV system confined to one building with the programs originating in the studio and carried to classrooms by coaxial cable. This latter is the ETV that is utilized at Salesianum School in Wilmington, and I will try in the short time allotted to me to give you some idea of the workings of this system.

The electronic equipment of our closed-circuit television system consists basically of three television cameras, two microphones, a video tape recorder and tuner, and related equipment to make these elements function. All of this equipment is located in a room especially set aside as a TV studio and control room, and from this center a coaxial cable is spread throughout the school connecting 23-inch TV receivers in eighteen different classrooms with this central studio.

In the studio the teacher teaches his class before two cameras mounted on dollies, and these cameras are equipped with a variety of lens of sizes designed to get close-up shots, wide-angle shots, and so forth. One of the cameras is equipped with a zoom lens for a more dramatic effect. The third camera is located in the adjoining control room and is rigged in permanent fashion to a 16mm. movie projector and to a slide projector so that on cue a film clip or any number of slides can be sent over the equipment to illustrate any portion of the teacher's lecture. A rather inexpensive camera is used to make these 2-inch slides used in the slide projector.

The teacher then in the studio presents his class in much the same fashion as he would in a conventional classroom atmosphere, with some quite significant differences, however. One difference is that he is teaching in an empty room looking into the eye of several electronic gadgets instead of the sparkling eyes of an entranced classroom audience. This can be unnerving to a beginning TV teacher, but after a few classes he learns to live with the blinking red eyes of the camera.

A second significant difference in technique is that a teacher can't just stand and speak into a camera, because this would become rather monotonous and would result in a consequent loss of attention on the part of the viewers in the classrooms. He must, therefore, intersperse his lecture with visuals—charts, pictures, diagrams, et cetera—whatever will lend some dramatic effect to his presentation and create enough variety and movement to make his presentation more animated. This is where the slide projector, the 16 mm.

projector, and other bits of studio equipment play a very important role in a TV presentation.

The third important difference in TV teaching, at least in the Salesianum system, is that the teacher is one part of a team-teaching organization. In each of the classrooms to which a lecture is shown, there is a teacher who has been given, in advance, an outline of the day's lecture along with suggestions for a TV briefing and a post-TV discussion. The teacher in the studio and the classroom teachers are, therefore, involved in team teaching in all its ramifications. For each subject taught on TV a coordinator is a vital part of this team teaching for it is his function to see that the teachers are kept in communication with one another, that tests are administered properly, and that the relay of TV teachers in a certain subject area is following the syllabus worked out at the beginning of the semester.

I said, "relay of TV teachers." For two of the three subjects we teach at Salesianum, we have divided the topics among five or six teachers and thereby spread the work and, at the same time, assigned topics to those teachers best qualified to handle them. The exception to this is in the Introductory Science courses which one teacher, Father Lange, handled entirely by himself.

What subjects are best taught on TV? It seems that any subject can be taught on TV well if you have the teachers with the ingenuity and imagination to handle it. At Salesianum we chose Religion, National Problems, and Freshman Science because the teachers in those three departments seemed most enthusiastic about the project. We put the freshmen and sophomore sections on a two-year-cycle course, and thus we teach eighteen sections of freshmen and sophomores the same Religion course. We put the junior and senior sections on a two-year-cycle, teaching them National Problems this current year and we will teach them American history next year. The saving in manpower and class preparation by means of cycling subjects this way is, I hope, rather obvious.

I am sure that there must be a number of administrators listening to me, who are wondering how many problems arise in trying to schedule eighteen sections for the same subject at the same period of the day. Father Lynn and I last summer did the scheduling, and while there were some added difficulties we were surprised that they were rather few. We have recently acquired a video tape recorder and expect many of these problems to be simplified; because now we can schedule, for example, twelve sections of Religion at third period and the other six sections at another period, and simply present the taped version the second time around. The video tape recorder, by the way, not only gives greater flexibility to the scheduling, but enables the teacher to have his class any time he wishes, change what he is not satisfied with and, incidentally, gives him that gift which Bobby Burns prayed for so earnestly—to see himself as others see him. I might add, by the way, that the experience of watching yourself on video tape is a real shocker, and it takes a very vain man indeed to look at his first taped TV show and say very complacently, "Not bad at all."

I hope I haven't made all this seem too simple. It's not simple, actually. Before we went on the air last September 12, we put in a busy summer assembling our equipment and making our plans. I hope I have left many questions unanswered, and I have done so because we have on the panel today Father Lange, who handles our production problems, and Father Campbell, who is ready to answer questions as to student reaction, attention,

retention, and learning achievement. We will first ask our technician here to turn on a TV wide-screen projector, and we'll show you briefly excerpts from some of the classes we've done in the past few months. When that is finished, Fathers Lange and Campbell and myself will be here to answer questions as long as there are people to ask them.

[Demonstration followed.]

Scheduling To Accommodate Large Enrollments

(Summary)

BROTHER LAURENTIAN PETER, F.S.C.

Director, Xavier High School, Appleton, Wisconsin

BASED ON A PRINCIPLE of "freedom with responsibility" or "independence with maturity," the Appleton Plan at the Xavier High School places considerably more responsibility for his education on the shoulders of the student. Briefly, the student has time and freedom for independent study in and out of school. This is brought about through the policy of being on campus only for class; if he is not scheduled for a class, it is not necessary for the student to be in school, or on the campus, for that matter.

Actual class schedule resembles that of the college for all practical purposes, with classes meeting three times per week for non-lab courses, four times per week for lab courses. These class periods are all 70 minutes in length, enabling the student to secure the lengths of instruction required by North Central Association for accreditation.

The use of his free time is determined largely by the initiative of the student. He is encouraged to use whatever facilities are available at the school during his between-class periods. Resource areas such as library, labs, whether science or language, are used or not used according to his desires or needs.

Xavier feels it is its primary responsibility to tackle the genuinely educational task of developing the necessary maturity and responsibility in those lacking it. It does not deny that it must guide and cajole, encourage and persuade those who would prefer to vegetate or remain academically passive.

Along with this primary task, however, there runs a parallel objective at Xavier of providing room for an increase of enrollment 200 to 300 beyond the capacity of the building under the conventional schedule. Having a \$500,000 debt of five-years standing precluded the hope of expansion of facilities. Accepting all the students who wished to enter, without sacrificing excellence in the academic program, presented a difficult problem which, in the mind of the administration, seemed to have only one solution—that of a somewhat revolutionary approach, a "desecration" of some of the sacred cows in academic scheduling, and a different perspective in programming students for their career in high school.

Adopting such a plan, Xavier has been able to enroll 650 boys in a department designed for 450 without sacrificing any degree of excellence in its academic program. The enrollment for 1964-65 will increase another 75 to 100 with little change, if any, in existing facilities.

The 70-minute period, meeting three times a week, and the extension of the school week to include Saturday morning, allow for an increase of 45 percent already for this year and could allow increase up to 60-70 percent over constructed capacity (with conventional 5 x 5 schedule). The school year 1963-64 is the first and only year we have been operating under this Xavier plan.

The number of boys at Xavier 1962-63 was 532; 1963-64, 652. The faculty for 1962-63 was 22.1 (full-time equivalent, N. C. A.); for 1963-64, 26.6 (full-time equivalent, N.C.A.). The pupil-teacher ratio for 1962-63 was 24.52. This was kept the same in 1963-64 to allow for emergencies in adopting new schedule and to immediately broaden the offerings without waiting for the full increase of students needed to balance classes economically.

The normal teacher load: 15 periods of class and 2 study periods. Science teachers carry more class periods, therefore, fewer study periods, if any. This is a total of 19 hours and 50 minutes of *class* time weekly, compared to 23 hours and 20 minutes of *class* time with standard 55-minute periods meeting five days a week.

The normal student load is five academic subjects and two periods of physical education. This entails 17 class meetings per week; slightly more if a particular subject meets four times a week. This is a total of 19 hours and 50 minutes of class time weekly, compared with 23 hours and 20 minutes of *class* time with the standard 55-minute periods meeting five days a week. Chorus and band (enrichment subjects generally) meet at 7:30 to 8:40 three days a week.

After seven months of operation, it appears that the more capable student, whether he be a ninth or twelfth grader, is able to profit significantly from such a schedule. Having the desire to excel academically, he is given unusual opportunity to use his initiative in determining his outside-class schedule—his study budget, his making good use of resource areas, planning his long-range assignments, reading, recreation—under much less pressure than he has had heretofore.

The average student apparently has found that he can become drunk with his freedom and that it is up to him to produce through guidance counselor, academic adviser, the solicitude of his parents and teachers. Failures in the first quarter shocked most into renewed efforts to stick to budgets of time for study and for recreation rather than continue on an easy-go policy.

The poor students seem to remain poor with this schedule (and as we have found out, through any other schedule as well). However, we do have the requirement of additional study periods if they have failures: for one failure, for example, three extra study periods per week are required; for two or more failures, five study halls are required.

Teacher schedules follow much the same pattern as the typical student schedule. Faculty members unanimously approve the schedule in view of the time it affords for lesson preparation. In fact, with the longer period, each teacher must prepare especially well in order that the time spent in class be utilized totally for instruction. The burden of the conventional schedule is alleviated by the time lapses between class periods. Saturday

morning classes, while difficult to inaugurate, are approached now with the same attitude as the Monday-through-Friday classes. Parents had to orient themselves and their families to this extension of the school week, but after the first few weeks, have become used to the routine. Teachers prefer morning classes on Saturday to late afternoon classes during the week because the student is much more receptive and alert to instruction in the morning hours.

The Xavier plan has saved the contributing parishes close to a half-million dollars in construction costs for the school year 1963-64. Were the students to be programmed on the conventional schedule, additional classroom space, toilet facilities, and study areas would have had to be provided.

Weaknesses in the schedule and/or physical facilities have become obvious to the administration during the year. Although we secured the flexibility we wished in the matter of scheduling, too-long lapses between class periods have existed for a number of the students; these will be remedied for the most part in the next year's schedule by closer adherence to patterns. Larger study areas for personal study—carrels, especially, will have to be added to make the program workable. Library resources must be added, geared for this type of schedule: typing areas for student use, listening rooms, viewers for microfilmed texts, etc.

Because it involves the future of human beings, educational experimentation must certainly be preceded by thorough investigation. For precisely the same reason, when thorough investigation evidences reasonable hope of progress, action must certainly be taken. Educators have no right to experiment injudiciously, but neither have they the right to refuse to experiment when the path seems sound and promising. Too much is at stake.

This has been a description of such an experiment, the description of the work of a group of educators who were willing to undertake and who still are engaged in all that experimentation involves. Our venture is not wholly unique; it may, however, prove of great value in that it provides a framework in which many other experiments may bear much fruit. It is quite conceivable that this vehicle may offer more hopes for team teaching, more hope for the nongraded secondary school than other conventional systems.

Because this experiment has promise, this report has been given. Our hope is that others reading this report will be encouraged to experiment on their own, in this or other patterns not yet known.

SOME PROS, CONS, AND OBSERVATIONS

1. *Pro*: Reduction of teacher load, with the attendant reduction of pressure upon the teachers. As a result, the teachers feel that they are better prepared when they enter class; they can do more long-range planning, can give more attention to student work, can meet with students in small groups more easily, and can balance the day's and week's load more reasonably.

Con: Since class meetings are more infrequent—108 yearly vs. 180 in the conventional 5 x 5 scheduling—teachers find they must make very good use of every minute of class time and must make only the most meaningful home assignments. This, of course, is a different form of pressure upon the teachers.

In some cases, the present Appleton schedule has resulted in fewer actual minutes of class time for instruction than some conventional systems. Whether or not this is desirable is an open question. It is quite possible, however, that a fresh

and apparently sound approach to the problem of the basic educational process at the secondary level may in the end produce better results despite the shortage of a few minutes.

Observation: The administration and faculty seem aware of both of these difficulties and have neither "canonized" the present 70-minute periods nor accepted the total of 210 minutes per week as a necessarily ideal arrangement. From the point of view of total class time, an 80-minute period seems at least worth investigating. This would provide 240 minutes per week, compared to the conventional minimum-maximum of 200-280 minutes per week. A 90-minute period might also be desirable with a provision for directed study (if such a theory is realistic) at the end of each class period.

What is far more important, however, is that the schools not move from one lockstep arrangement to another. It should be possible, although difficult, to schedule some classes (on some occasions or on all occasions) for 120 minutes rather than 80 minutes (or for 105 minutes instead of 70 minutes, if this is the usual period length).

2. *Pro:* Greater flexibility of scheduling for classes, for individual students, and for faculty members. Clearly, with an increased number of available periods and a decreased number of required periods for each subject, for each teacher, and for each student, many more scheduling arrangements are possible.

Con: As the school population grows, however, this advantage gradually disappears. Xavier, for example, is built for 900, yet could, in our opinion, accommodate 1500 to 1600 under the new plan—a 66 percent to 70 percent increase in capacity. As this capacity is gradually increased, some flexibility will have to be sacrificed.

Observation: The administration must keep a close eye on the population increase, to know when to stop. It would seem that a 50 percent increase would be about the maximum desirable increase; this would allow some 10-20 percent play for flexibility of scheduling.

3. *Pro:* Development of student initiative and independent study habits. Students do have the freedom and the time for independent study in and out of school.

Con: There is a very real danger that some students may be either unwilling to accept or inept at assuming more responsibility for their own education.

Observation: For the unwilling, counseling is needed; for the inept, counseling, training, and some minor regulations are needed. Xavier is aware of the need to re-establish the close adviser-advisee relationship that disappeared when the schedule structure supporting it was reorganized. More one-to-one confrontation is possible under the new schedule and should be provided for; this is a significant asset of the schedule. If this asset is to be realized, however, small private counseling offices should surely be available.

It is the practice at Xavier of having each student, consulting with his adviser, prepare a written budget of his class and study time. Some form of group guidance orienting beginning freshmen to the strengths and weaknesses of their new schedule seems advisable.

We have taken the further safeguard of *requiring* a certain amount of supervised study for students with failures (three periods per week for one failure, five periods per week for more than one). It should be noted, though, that most

students are averaging more than five study periods per week, required or not. It would seem, therefore, that personal study responsibility is being accepted.

Also, we intend to utilize the talents of N.H.S. students in helping the less capable student either in individual tutoring or supervising their study areas, in the latter case freeing the faculty for far more professional use of their time.

During 1963-64, a fourth period for laboratory courses was assigned as part of the schedule of classes. The basic principle behind the Appleton plan would seem to argue that the student should simply be required to put in an hour (or whatever is required) of laboratory work per week. For 1964-65, we plan to give both student and teacher more flexibility in scheduling laboratory work.

4. *Pro:* Broadening of the school's total program of offerings and a consequent increase in possibilities for remediation and enrichment, where needed or desired. An increase of the number of students will ordinarily allow for a greater spread of courses and greater homogeneity within sections of the same course, thus acting as an enabling factor for remedial programs, honors, and advanced placement programs, special courses, and so on.

Con: The stronger the academic program, the more the teachers will really need the time returned to them in this plan of scheduling. The administration could create a disadvantage if it cluttered up the faculty schedule with other assignments because the teachers seem to have so much "free" time.

Observation: Team-teaching will be begun as soon as the faculty is so oriented; in many ways the new schedule adapts quite readily to this powerful technique. Adequate and suitably equipped faculty study and meeting space will have to be provided, for the same reasons the students need space—only more so.

5. *Pro:* Broadening of the financial base (tuitions paid) upon which the school depends. An increase in the number of students accompanied by little or no increase in either buildings or maintenance and by a somewhat smaller increase in faculty must bring about an increase in revenue. This can be used to increase faculty, to increase salaries, and benefits, to install or renovate facilities, to support smaller classes, to increase departmental budgets, to finance experimental programs, or to relieve any of a great number of problems faced by all school administrators.

Con: If the administration does not plan beforehand which one or several of these benefits it desires, the mechanics of the scheduling process will make the choice automatically and perhaps unwisely. At Xavier we chose to keep the pupil-teacher ratio constant (24.52 both this year and last by N.C.A. calculations) in order to immediately broaden the offerings without waiting for the full increase of students needed to balance classes economically. As a result, savings so far returnable and under the new schedule have, in effect, been spent on increase of faculty and on smaller classes.

Observation: Financial conditions, pressing needs, and administrative decision will control the course of action here.

It is, of course, quite possible for a school to use the Appleton plan of scheduling without immediately increasing enrollment. In this case, the benefits resulting from the change can be used to improve in some ways the existing set-up for the present students and faculty. Later, it may or may not be desirable to add more students, to harvest more fully some of the other benefits of the plan.

CONCLUSION

Whether the Appleton schedule is a contribution to the educational scene is debatable at this point. It would seem unwise to predict the academic advantages inherent in the system after only seven months of operation. Most probably, it will take between four to six years to determine validly the successes or weaknesses—and this by investigating the successes or failures developing in the Xavier graduate, both the high school terminal student and the college-bound.

Freedom and a sense of responsibility are invaluable characteristics of the mature adult. Hopefully, the Xavier graduate will have been prepared through ninth to twelfth grade to secure the one by practicing the other. It remains to be seen to what degree a scholastic schedule based on such principles can help to develop these enviable characteristics.

What is incontestable is the fact that with the schedule, the students desiring entrance to Xavier have been accommodated without sacrificing the standard of excellence that has been maintained in the academic program. Also, a savings of close to \$500,000 has been effected in 1963-64, which, under the conventional plan, would have been necessary for construction—which itself would not have been completed in time for the 1963-64 enrollment. Plans for expansion are being prepared now, but the type of construction will be geared to the schedule to be followed—not the traditional addition of classrooms to accommodate more students, but the intelligent arrangement for additional facilities to foster individual development, initiative, in terms of the “revolutionary” schedule. Increased library-study space, individual study areas, resource areas—language labs, reading labs, viewers in library for microfilmed sources, etc., team-teaching arrangements, faculty study area, and preparation area. This is the new approach; the schedule lends itself to it most accommodatingly.

• *PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS*

The Curriculum Advisory Committees

A Position Paper on English in the Catholic Secondary School

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT of its mandate, the National Advisory Committee for High School English of the NCEA presents this report as a position paper which will examine briefly some selected concerns in the field and make appropriate recommendations.

The members of the committee—all actively engaged in school work—in no way presume to present here more than highlights. Their observations do not constitute a research study, but are informed by two years of inde-

pendent studies (which have been reported elsewhere) and attendant committee conferences. It is the hope of the Advisory Committee that this position paper on present-day concerns will aid in unifying and bringing into focus some of the problems that call for deliberate examination at the high school level.

Administration

A growing complexity in the teaching of English must force the attention of administrators to the need for a carefully planned, thorough, and effective organization of the Department of English within a school. Such a department cannot be vital if its name represents merely an entry on a *Table of Organization*. It must be headed by a teacher of recognized ability, experience, and diplomacy, in whom should reside such authority by delegation as will enable close and forceful administration. The organization of such a department must as far as possible and feasible be left to the professional teachers themselves under the guidance of the Chairman. The latter should be granted an area of decision-making; he must plan syllabi, courses, approaches, special programs, and aids; he should have adequate time for observation of department work, for conference with teachers, and for liaison work with similar departments in other schools, public and private.

The English Department and its Chairman should have a clear knowledge of the amount of its yearly budget which should be realistic and, wherever possible, generous. Provision must be made, for example, for the acquisition of audio-visual material and other aids including, we suggest, a departmental reference and critical library which would be available to teachers apart from regular library resources. If possible, a room should be provided to house these aids, and adequate space for conference should be considered. Large amounts of money are well spent yearly for science courses to be taught to a relatively small portion of the student body in specially equipped rooms. It is reasonable to assume that English, which involves the entire student body, should command an analogous interest and effort.

Administrators should study seriously the recommendations of many competent individuals and groups (such as the NCTE) that no teacher of English should have more than 100 students a day in total class load. However difficult the problems posed by this recommendation, or however apparently justified its rejection by claims of practicality, the administrator should at least be aware that in avoiding this advice he ignores the most competent professional opinion available. If the results in his school are in marked derogation of his hopes, he might well look—in remedy—to his policy in this matter. The efforts, ingenuity, and stamina of human beings are open to command up to a point; beyond that, even private virtue and the utmost good will cannot cope with the impossible.

Administrators ought not commit the transmission of cultural and social values to ineptly trained teachers. For, if they do, a school's major purposes may be meanly served. Further, unless teachers are properly educated and trained, supervisory problems will be unmanageable, and the effective teaching of the native language impossible.

It seems that a bachelor's degree with a major in English Language and Literature is the minimal requirement for teachers of English; a master's degree is obviously preferable, and, in an increasing number of places, mandatory. Yet the degree programs currently available in our colleges and universities are not always adequate to the current and growing demands being made

upon teachers. To be specific, this Advisory Committee makes the following recommendations for the training of English teachers:

1. That there be required courses in the history of the English language and the varied modern approaches to linguistic study;
2. That an intensive study of rhetorical principles together with copious practice in their use be demanded;
3. That both historical and analytical methods be given weight in curriculum planning for English majors and that the student be trained in a variety of approaches to a literary work, the determination of its total meaning and importance, and its relevance to a history of ideas and to a cultural tradition. This could be effected in genre-type courses, courses in critical theory and analysis, studies in major trends and periods, and work with major literary figures.

Such programs would, we think, better equip the young teachers who will be graduated from our colleges and universities. For those currently engaged in teaching, in-service courses of a like nature should be provided where their need is evident; for this purpose, money should be made available from whatever source, including diocesan support if necessary.

Lastly, we recommend this section of the report to the attention of Departments of English in our colleges and universities. We feel that what has been suggested here will reinforce what they themselves can easily and willingly support in the proper education of teachers of English. We recommend to their consideration this salient fact—that a portion of their students will teach English and should be so directed that they will eventually be a credit to the profession.

Language

The current revolution in the study of the English language has provoked so much controversy that one thinks now in terms not of one grammar but, rather, according to the analysts, of four: 1) traditional or prescriptive; 2) historical; 3) structural or descriptive; 4) transformational or generative.

Among linguists themselves disagreement exists as to the practical value of these modern approaches in the teaching of English in high school. Most agree that traditional grammar is too prescriptive and authoritarian. Structural linguistics, emphasizing phonology and grammar, is perhaps inadequate in that it excludes a consideration of meaning and in that it can describe only differences in construction. Though transformational grammar is credited with being a synthesis of the best features of the others, it is not at the present time sufficiently explored and developed for adequate judgment.

It is quite apparent on the basis of such disagreement that no one analysis of grammar has as yet been universally accepted.

What recommendations, then, can serve to orient the teacher in the daily work of the classroom?

Associating itself with the position of the Commission of English Curriculum of the NCTE and with the thinking of individual scholars, this English Advisory Committee makes these recommendations to the classroom teacher:

1. Teach that change in a living language is normal;
2. Teach that the spoken language is primary, but is not the sum total of language;

3. Teach that stress, intonation, and pitch are important;
4. Teach that sentence building is more valuable than sentence analysis;
5. Teach that punctuation is related to both grammar and intonation;
6. Teach that language is composed of dialects and that levels of usage are utilized;
7. Teach that, though usage is relative and sovereign, such values as social utility, aesthetics, and intellectual breadth justify some prescriptionist grammar in the schools. Teachers should study the ever-expanding field of linguistics, maintain an open mind, but understand that, though linguists can at present teach more accurate information than the traditionalists, they themselves are undecided about the extent to which their science can be used to advantage pedagogically and practically in the teaching of high school English.

English Literature and Composition

It is generally recognized that literature and composition make up the substance of high school English courses. The Advisory Committee recommends that the work of composition be related to the literature whenever possible. That is, literature and composition should be made to work together toward the same basic goals. For example, if the aim of grade 9 be set as the awakening and refinement of the students' powers of sense observation, then sense observation and its results should be stressed in reading and writing.

In literature, the student should be confronted with the best writing he is capable of understanding. What is infantile is intolerable; what is proper for mature, adult minds should be left to them and not forced on unprepared youngsters. Today the survey course (English Literature, American Literature, World Literature) is under attack. Teaching literature by types and themes with emphasis on an analytic approach has able advocates. These systems have merit and a school is justified in adhering to one method or another or a combination.

Where world literature is taught, it is strongly recommended that it be integrated with present courses and not treated as a separate unit. The claim that world literature is necessary to acquaint students with the cultures of other nations is perhaps to misinterpret the objectives of the course of literature. Literature should be studied for itself. It may have beneficial side effects, but these effects should not be confused with major objectives.

The high school composition course should be integrated with the literature studied because it gives students an opportunity to write something that is both individual to them and also the common property of the group. Under enlightened direction this method can allow for complete and responsible freedom of opinion on disputed questions. It would tend to place the emphasis on expository writing where it probably belongs, and it would tend to reconfirm the necessity of organization and manipulation of detail—creative elements that can make exposition vital and valuable.

This committee recognizes that there are many other problems in the field of English which cannot be reviewed here. Among these are the following: a sequential program in composition; the practical use of new techniques in teaching; honors programs and advanced placement; problems of the slow learner; the relation of speech to the English program; and so forth.

It is to be hoped that in the future, further position papers on these matters will be forthcoming from the NCEA.

Rev. JAMES E. FARRELL, S.J., *Chairman*

Testing in Foreign Languages

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF WORKING COMMITTEE

THE TRANSITION to the newer approach to the teaching of foreign languages is being successfully made by an increasing number of teachers. To the need for teaching materials suited to the new objectives and methods, authors and publishers have made an encouraging response. But we are still faced with a hampering lack in the crucial area of testing. Testing techniques that may have been adequate for the older objectives and methods are not adequate today. While some of the newer materials include suitable tests, these are mostly of the unit type. We need tests of a type to be given at much more frequent intervals. Until such time as authors and publishers provide them, we must devise them ourselves. Consequently, we must become more familiar with the basic principles of test construction.

In the meantime, those of us who are using audio-lingually oriented texts can adapt many of the teaching drills for testing purposes. As a further aid in evaluation of our students and of our methods, it is recommended that we use properly devised extramural tests of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, such as the MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests, or others which may be equally suitable.

JAMES M. FERRIGNO, *Chairman*
University of Dayton

ARCHIE E. LAPOINTE
McGraw-Hill Book Company

ROBERT P. SERAFINO
Educational Testing Service

Summaries: Advisory Committees

ADVISORY COMMITTEES were set up in 1962 to study the current trends in curriculum in six subject areas in Catholic high schools—English, foreign languages, science, mathematics, religion, and social studies.

General objectives of the Advisory Committees were:

1. To determine three specific points of information about the curriculum in the various subject areas in Catholic high schools:
 - a) Who does the actual planning of curriculum?
 - b) How are curriculum decisions being made and introduced?
 - c) What curriculum changes are occurring?
2. To assemble this information through six Advisory Committees so it will include:
 - a) Cross sections of practices throughout the country.
 - b) Trends within distinct subject areas.
 - c) Dissenting as well as concurring judgments on trends and practices.

3. To report results to Catholic high school administrators and teachers to provide them with:

- a) A survey of current curriculum practices and trends.
- b) A critique of some of these trends.
- c) A list of suggestions for improvement in some curriculum areas.

The committees began their work at the NCEA's 59th annual convention held in Detroit in April, 1962, gave interim reports at the St. Louis convention in 1963,¹ and final reports at the Atlantic City convention in 1964. Four reports have been published in issues of the *Catholic High School Quarterly Bulletin*, as follows:

"Mathematics in the Catholic High School," October 1963.

"Foreign Languages in the Catholic High School," January 1964; April 1964.

(Separate reports on "Testing in Foreign Languages" and "Latin Methods and Materials" will appear in forthcoming issues of the *High School Bulletin*; summaries appear below.)

"Science in the Catholic High School," July 1964.

The reports on the teaching of social studies (including a separate paper on "The Problem of Articulation in the Social Studies," and the report on Religion will be published in the departmental *Bulletin*; summaries are given below. A position paper on "English in the Catholic Secondary School" appears on pages 298-301 of this volume.

CONVENTION SUMMARIES

SCIENCE.—The following members of the Advisory Committee on Science gave papers at the 1964 convention:

BSCS Biology: Sister Julia Marie, O.S.F., Holy Family College, Manitowoc, Wisconsin, Green Version; Sister Mary Debora, R.S.M., St. Mary Academy, Little Rock, Arkansas, Yellow Version; Sister Mary Ivo, B.V.M., The Immaculata, Chicago, Blue Version.

PSSC Physics: The speakers were Brother Gregory Nazianzen, F.S.C., La Salle College High School, Philadelphia, and Brother William Fitch, C.S.C., Archbishop Hoban High School, Akron, Ohio.

CHEMS Chemistry: Sister Therese Ann, O.P., St. Alphonsus High School, Dearborn, Michigan, and Sister M. Irenaea, C.P.P.S., Regina High School, Cincinnati, Ohio, were the speakers.

CBA Chemistry: Sister James Francis, S.S.J., Cathedral High School, Springfield, Massachusetts, was the speaker.

Brother Fred Weisbruch, S.M., Vianney High School, St. Louis, Missouri, was chairman of the meeting and spoke informally on junior high school science in the 7th, 8th, and 9th grades. Sister M. Ambrosia, I.H.M., of the Holy Redeemer High School, Detroit, concluded the session with "A Look at the Future."

SOCIAL STUDIES.—The following members of the Advisory Committee on Social Studies gave papers at the 1964 convention:

¹ See *Fostering the Ecumenical Spirit*, NCEA Proceedings, 1962, pp. 348-60; and *Catholic Education: Progress and Prospects*, NCEA Proceedings, 1963, pp. 350-63.

Sister M. Josella, S.C.N., of Archbishop Williams High School, Braintree, Massachusetts, reported on "Project Social Studies," a program initiated and subsidized by the U.S. Office of Education. "To date, seven curriculum centers, eleven research projects, two Stimulating Activities, and Small Contract programs are operating under government grants." Sister Josella urged Catholic educators to take advantage of this opportunity.

Other speakers included: Brother Leonard Fabian, F.S.C., of Chicago, on "Principles for Building a Curriculum"; Brother Stephen de la Salle, F.S.C., on "American History in the 9th Year"; Brother J. Arnold de la Salle, F.S.C., on "Geography and Western European History in the 10th Grade"; Brother Denis, F.S.C., on "World Culture in the 11th Grade"; Brother Harold Bertram, F.S.C., on "Senior Social Studies"; and Sister Alfreda Marie, C.S.C., Academy of St. Catherine, Ventura, California, on "The Problem of Articulation in the Social Studies." Brother Luke of Jesus, F.S.C., St. George High School, Evanston, Illinois, summarized the discussions. Rev. George Tiffany of the Cardinal Hayes High School, New York City, was chairman of the session.

LATIN METHODS AND MATERIALS.—Panelists at the 1964 convention were: Sister Rosamond Nugent, O.S.F., Holy Family College, Manitowoc, Wisconsin; Sister Therese Hines, S.N.D., Convent of Notre Dame, Bridgeport, Connecticut; Rev. Cyprian Towey, C.P., Mother of Good Counsel Seminary, Warrenton, Missouri; Rev. Paul F. Distler, S.J., of Saint Louis University High School; Rev. Eugene Brochtrup, S.N.D., Chairman of the working committee, chaired the session at the convention. The committee has completed its final report, which will appear in a forthcoming issue of the Secondary School Department's *Quarterly Bulletin*.

Annual Report of the Regional Units, April 1, 1964

NEW ENGLAND UNIT

The New England Unit met Saturday, December 7, 1963, at Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts. The morning program was a panel on "The Means of Achieving Greater Articulation Between Colleges and Secondary Schools." Panelists were Rev. Royal J. Gardner, O.P., Providence College; Brother Cosmas Francis, F.S.C., Narragansett, R.I.; Sister M. Gratia, O.P., Albertus Magnus College; Sister Angela Elizabeth, S.N.D., Notre Dame Academy, Worcester. His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, D.D., gave an address.

The afternoon panel on "The Critical Future of Social Studies in the Secondary Schools" had as panelists: Mr. Owen L. Eagan, De La Salle Academy, Newport, R.I.; Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X.; and Dr. Arthur Foshay, Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute, Columbia University.

EASTERN UNIT

The Eastern Unit held a meeting at Chalfonte-Haddon Hall, Atlantic City, New Jersey, December 6, 1963. Brother E. Anthony, F.S.C., president of the Secondary School Department, National Catholic Educational Association,

spoke on "New Horizons for the Regional Unit." "Current Church-State Problems in Education" was the topic of Mr. William B. Ball, Executive Director and General Counsel, Pennsylvania Catholic Welfare Committee, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

SOUTHERN UNIT

The Southern Unit met December 2, 1963, at the Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tennessee. Dr. Scarvia B. Anderson, Director of Research and Development, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, held conferences on "School Testing" and "Making Your Own Tests."

SOUTHWEST UNIT

The main business that has been absorbing the attention of the Southwest Regional Unit has been the study of the growth and policies of a new accrediting agency. Formerly the University of California was the sole accrediting agency for secondary schools in that state. When the University indicated that it wanted to relinquish some of its responsibility in this area, the Catholic schools formed an organization called the Western Education Association for the purpose of evaluating their own schools. While they were doing this the Western Association of Colleges agreed to include high schools in its scope of authority. This expanded organization is now known as the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and has become the accrediting agency for the majority of public and private high schools in California.

Because of the variations in attitudes of various dioceses regarding the present organization and policies of WASC, a study of its evaluation procedure has been undertaken. This study, now nearing completion, is conducted under the co-chairmanship of Rev. John M. Hynes, S.J., and Brother V. Eugene, F.S.C.

The new president of the Southwest Regional Unit, elected at the December, 1963, regional meeting is Brother V. Girard, principal of Cathedral High School, Los Angeles.

NORTHWEST REGIONAL UNIT

The annual meeting of the Northwest Regional Unit was held at the University of Portland, Portland, Oregon, December 1, 1963. The keynote address was given by Rev. Bernard J. Cooke, S.J., chairman, Department of Theology, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. His topic was, "New Directions in Teaching of Theology and Religion in Colleges and High Schools."

In the afternoon, a general session was conducted by Rev. Joseph E. Perri, S.J., principal, Jesuit High School, Portland, Oregon.

HAWAIIAN UNIT

The Hawaiian Unit had its annual meeting at St. Theresa's School Auditorium, 712 North School St., Honolulu, January 13, 1964. Lt. Cmdr. Victor Ivers, Chaplain, U.S.N., and Rev. Donald G. Graff spoke on the

"Liturgy and the Word of God." There also were panel discussions entitled "The School Library" and "New Math."

The unit also had monthly meetings of all officers, plus religious supervisors, and various subject chairmen—about twenty in all. The following has been done since the start of the school year:

1. Sent two representatives to every elementary school in the diocese (includes three other Islands) in order to further the program of the English syllabus.

2. Also sent the math chairman to all the schools; (this was a sort of in-service and burdens us with transportation costs and substitute teachers).

3. Sent three representatives to San Francisco during the Thanksgiving holidays for the meeting of the National Association of English Teachers.

4. Sent one representative to Chicago in January for the ETV meeting sponsored by NCEA.

Future items on the agenda are the following (all three items will be carried out since members have voted on them):

1. They will sponsor a Professional Growth Conference in April.

2. They hope to get the Governor (he is an alumnus of St. Louis High School) to issue a proclamation in May entitled, "Teacher Recognition Day." The State Superintendent of Public Instruction has promised his cooperation.

3. They will sponsor a math workshop during August. This is to be given by Father Stanley Bezuska of Boston College.

MIDWEST UNIT

There have been three meetings of the officers and planning committee of the Midwest Unit. In October, the question was raised as to the advisability of the Midwest Unit meeting in conjunction with the North Central Association at a time so close to the NCEA meeting in Atlantic City. The question of why the very existence of the Midwest Unit was raised. After much discussion, it was thought best to hold another meeting in the month of November. At this meeting and at the meeting in February, 1964, it was thought best not to have a general meeting at the time. In all probability, letters have been sent from the Regional Chairman to the National Executive Committee explaining and raising questions as to the future of the Midwest Unit.

Respectfully submitted,

BROTHER JUDE ALOYSIUS, F.S.C.

Chairman, Regional Units

Lewis College, Lockport, Illinois

Secondary School Department: Officers 1964-65

President: Very Rev. Msgr. Henry Gardner, Kansas City, Kansas

Vice President: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Doogan, Seattle, Washington

Secretary: Brother Edwin Goerd, S.M., St. Louis, Missouri

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. Leo Keaveny, Little Falls, Minnesota

Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X., Newton Highlands, Massachusetts

Officers 1964-65—Continued

Department Executive Committee

Ex officio members

The President, Vice President, and Secretary
 Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edmund J. Goebel, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. Leo Keaveny, Little Falls, Minnesota
 Brother Bartholomew, C.F.X., Newton Highlands, Massachusetts
 Rev. C. Albert Koob, O. Praem., Washington, D.C., Associate Secretary

General members

Rev. Joseph T. O'Keefe, Yonkers, New York
 Rev. Lorenzo K. Reed, S.J., New York, N.Y.
 Rev. Joseph Lynn, O.S.F.S., Wilmington, Delaware
 Rev. John E. O'Connell, O.P., Dallas, Texas
 Rev. Gerard Benson, O. Carm., Houston, Texas
 Rev. John Sullivan, S.J., Chicago, Illinois
 Rev. Cuthbert Soukup, O.S.B., Collegeville, Minnesota
 Brother Bernard Gregory, F.M.S., Bronx, New York
 Brother Thaddeus, C.F.X., Brooklyn, New York
 Brother John Jansen, S.M., Dayton, Ohio
 Brother Alfonso Comeau, C.S.C., Gates Mills, Ohio
 Brother John Darby, S.M., Chester, Pennsylvania
 Brother Joseph McKenna, F.S.C.H., West Roxbury, Massachusetts
 Brother Jude Aloysius, F.S.C., Lockport, Illinois
 Brother C. O'Donnell, F.S.C.H., Butte, Montana
 Brother J. Stephen, F.S.C., Memphis, Tennessee
 Sister M. Elaine, S.S.N.D., Lake Charles, Louisiana
 Sister M. Elizabeth, S.L., Denver, Colorado
 Sister Francis Inez, S.S.J., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
 Sister M. Hildegardis, C.S.C., Salt Lake City, Utah
 Sister M. Patrice, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Sister M. Xavier, O.P., River Forest, Illinois
 Sister M. Paulita, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Sister M. Jerome, O.S.U., Youngstown, Ohio

Regional Unit Members

Brother Marcellus, C.F.X., Westwood, Massachusetts	}	New England
Rev. Thomas E. Lawton, C.S.C., North Easton, Massachusetts		
Rev. Joseph C. Hilbert, Lebanon, Pennsylvania	}	Eastern
Brother Benjamin Benedict, F.S.C., Lincroft, New Jersey		
Rev. John A. Elliott, Memphis, Tennessee	}	Southern
Rev. Walter C. McCauley, S.J., Dallas, Texas		
Brother Francis Haug, S.M., Belleville, Illinois	}	Midwestern
Rev. David Murphy, O.Carm., Mundelein, Illinois		
Rev. Joseph E. Perri, S.J., Portland, Oregon	}	Northwestern
Sister John Marian, S.N.J.M., Marylhurst, Oregon		
Brother Ignatius Kenny, F.S.C., San Francisco, California	}	Southwestern
Rev. Richard Maher, S.J., San José, California		
Brother Charles Ehrenfeld, S.M., Honolulu	}	Hawaii
Sister Catherine Therese, C.S.J., Kailua		

Castro Cuba and Latin America

JAMES B. DONOVAN

President, Board of Education, City of New York;

Member of firm of Watters & Donovan, Attorneys at Law

WHEN YOUR COMMITTEE graciously invited me to be with you today, it was to speak broadly on the subject of Latin America, its educational needs and opportunities. I do intend, before I close, to make a few observations with respect to the future of the whole of Latin America. However, it now has been made clear by your committee that you would prefer me to devote the greater part of my talk to an explanation of salient features of the "prisoner release" mission to Cuba.

To answer questions that are most frequently asked, and which have been asked here today: first of all, How did I become involved in this Cuban mission? Surely you all have read in the newspapers, as I have, that my mission was undertaken at the personal request of U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. This is not true.

In June of 1962 there called on me a group of the parents, brothers, and wives of these Cuban prisoners, survivors of the Bay of Pigs invasion. The prisoners were mostly boys under the age of twenty. They had been, their relatives told me, recruited by the United States, trained by the United States, sent in at the Bay of Pigs invasion with the approval of the United States and then (without going into detail as to precisely what ensued) they literally were abandoned by the United States, and permitted to run out of ammunition while killing Communists on the beaches in Cuba. By the time the relatives spoke to me, their sons and husbands had been in prison in Castro Cuba some fifteen months.

The Cuban Families Committee was sponsored by a group of distinguished Americans, organized for the specific humanitarian objective of seeking the release of these boys. The committee included Cardinal Cushing of Boston, Episcopal Bishop Pike of San Francisco, Chancellor Finkelstein of the Jewish Theological Seminary, General Lucius Clay, Herbert Hoover, Jr., and many other prominent Americans of all faiths and political beliefs. It appeared clear to me that all of us in this country owed a moral obligation to the survivors of the Bay of Pigs invasion and, furthermore, that the whole of Latin America was watching to see how we in the United States would discharge this moral obligation.

With respect to the Cuban mission itself, I frequently am asked, What was the turning point? The answer is simple. The decisive action came as soon as Premier Castro—and all negotiations were conducted personally with him—came to realize and accept the good faith of our mission: that I was there as a private person without diplomatic status or immunity, on behalf of a group of private American citizens seeking to accomplish a humanitarian result. It was also true and known to Castro that I was there with the full knowl-

edge and approval of the government of the United States, without, however, at any time having the mission change its private, humanitarian character.

I am pleased to report that General Gruenther, president of the American Red Cross, announced this past fall that the final totals of Cubans and Americans brought out of Cuba since Christmas Eve, 1962, on Red Cross planes and ships, amounted to over 9,700 men, women, and children. These included the 1,162 survivors of the Bay of Pigs invasion; some 5,000 members of their families; all Americans held in prison in Cuba; their families; a large number of other Americans wishing to be repatriated; and a great number of political prisoners from among the Cuban population.

We learned, in the course of the mission, as we brought out people on Red Cross planes and ships—some of the men had been in prison for over four years—the value of a touching expression from the Talmud, which perhaps expresses the thought best with its wisdom of thousands of years. That is: “To save one life is to save the whole world.” With respect to what was accomplished, I feel sure that the American Red Cross and all who so wonderfully cooperated in the mission, felt that it was most self-rewarding work.

As to the drugs, medicines, and baby foods that were distributed among the Cuban people in exchange for the release of 9,700 prisoners, a few words are in order. First of all, the rumor occasionally aired in parts of the press that drug companies were pressured by the United States Government into making these donations, is simply nonsense. The fact is that the entire affair was planned at the outset without the United States Government's knowledge and was arranged before the missile crisis, on a personal basis, because of my friendship with an immediate neighbor, John McKeen, president and chairman of the board of Pfizer and Company, and my schoolmate from Harvard Law school, John T. Connor, president of Merck and Company.

At the time the missile crisis took over, in October, 1962, Pfizer and Merck had the entire relief operation mounted out at Idlewild Airport. We had seven supercargo planes headed directly to Havana, with antibiotics and other medical supplies. The missile crisis then occurred and the mission had to be dismantled. It was only after the missile crisis, and after we had received repeated reports of the deteriorating physical condition of the prisoners, that we appealed to the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association, and the entire drug industry joined the effort.

As business administrators, quite apart from humanitarian instincts, I point out to you that all gifts to the American Red Cross not only were tax deductible but had a two-year carry-forward. While the Department of Justice did set up a special team of lawyers to grind out opinions reassuring all these companies that they were not violating the Logan Act, were not violating the antitrust laws, and were assured of the tax deductibility of their gifts, the nature of the Cuban mission as a private, humanitarian venture never changed.

On the other hand, unlike the students who returned last summer from Cuba, no aspect of our mission was undertaken without the full knowledge and full consent of every interested department of the United States Government. At all times we had their sympathetic cooperation, without in any manner their assuming control or direction of the operation.

Before any drug or medicine ever reached the island of Cuba, I read in Miami newspapers and other segments of the press that the entire project should be abandoned because “The Cuban people will never see the drugs. They will be shipped immediately to Soviet Russia.”

Now, this story commenced before any drug or medicine ever arrived in Cuba, and it is rather interesting to look back and see how this fable took hold. Only about three months ago, I read three stories in our press within one week. One was that the drugs and medicines were being peddled throughout Latin America. The second was that all the drugs and medicines had been shipped to Soviet Russia. The third was a feature article in the *U.S. News and World Report*, explaining that Alka-Seltzer was being sold at 25 cents too much in drugstores in Havana. It is perfectly evident, I think, that all these reports could not be true. What one learns after a time is that, in their understandable hatred of the tyrannical government of Castro, Cuban refugees have a tendency to say here whatever they think might possibly discredit his regime.

The simple fact is that our mission had four American Red Cross inspectors in Havana, who have attested to the distribution of these drugs throughout the island of Cuba. To their personal knowledge, and to my personal knowledge, we had people come up on the streets in Havana and thank us, because of sick relatives, children, or other related individuals who had been aided by our mission.

All of these drugs were labeled "Made in USA." A great number of them (to my surprise, because I did not know this was a policy of some pharmaceutical companies with respect to all their exports) had stamped on them tiny American flags. It was impractical to repackage such drugs. For the past year there has not been a person sick or in pain, or with a child sick or in pain, on the island of Cuba who could not help but feel grateful to the people of the United States. They know that at a time when Soviet Russia was pouring into Cuba not what the Cuban people needed, but what Soviet Russia wanted there for her own purposes, Americans on a people-to-people basis, recognizing the long-standing friendship between our two peoples, and recognizing the plight of the Cuban people under the present regime, came to their aid in the form of drugs, medicines, and baby foods. In my opinion, this has represented the most effective United States propaganda that has ever been carried on in a Latin American country. It has been worth fifty Voice of America broadcasts a day.

With respect to the negotiations themselves, Premier Castro at first was very hostile, especially since he was being advised by dedicated Communists seeking to influence his decisions. They hated me and my mission. Yet, on the other hand, it is a great mistake to believe that all those in high positions in Cuba today are Communists. This is simply not true. To this day I could sit in the garden of the house in which I was kept in Havana, and read international and domestic news, including news of my own mission, in three separate newspapers. One is *El Mundo*, sort of a nondescript journal. Another is *Revolucion*, a Fidelista paper. The third is *Hoy*—Communist propaganda. All three continue to be published and all definitely are censored. But they have marked editorial differences in many important respects. The point is that even today, in my opinion, the situation in Cuba remains more Latin and more Cuban than it is Marxist.

The Fidelista movement has taken hold in very great measure throughout the island of Cuba. It is discouraging, I know, to have to report this to you, but it is the simple truth. Castro has deliberately leveled his main thrust at the youth of the country. Lenin once said, "Give me the youth of a nation four years, and I can assure its future." Castro is now in his fifth year with the youth of Cuba. All these children go to government schools, where they

live and are heavily indoctrinated with pro-Communist, pro-Castro and anti-United States propaganda. In short, with an army and civilian militia totaling perhaps 400,000 today, any concept that dropping 20,000 U.S. marines into Cuba would mean a prompt end to the entire situation, is simply absurd. Even if all Russian troops and defenses were withdrawn, any U.S.-sponsored invasion would mean a long and bloody struggle.

These are simple facts. At times people tend to think in terms of what might have been done back at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion in early 1961. Castro himself told me he then had only seven military aircraft and did not have enough trained pilots to man those seven planes. But, as of today, with hundreds of pilots trained in Poland and Czechoslovakia as well as Russia, and with the military planes he has received, it is idle to talk in terms of an invasion being a trivial, minor conflict.

What remains for the future in Cuba is most difficult to predict. It depends very clearly upon what our government does, what the Soviet government does, and what Red China does. All three nations are important factors in the future of Cuba.

The net effect at the present time, of course, is that we are confronted with a socialist island only ninety miles away from our mainland. As one writer wrote not long ago, "There has been no invasion, no blockade, and yet, no talk." The economy in Cuba has been in grave trouble, primarily at the outset for a lack of spare parts, since virtually everything over there was made in the United States. With our embargo, whatever breaks down simply could not be repaired. Almost none of such equipment and materials could be replaced from behind the Iron Curtain. The metric system is used instead of our own system in most such countries, and they cannot repair broken-down United States equipment, even in the most necessary places.

On the other hand, no one is starving in Cuba. It is a rich island and Castro took over a very great inventory. The island is very fertile and crops can be grown three times a year. Nevertheless, due to bureaucratic bungling, poor economic planning, and all the other defects that can exist in a system of planned socialism, there is no question but that the economy of the island of Cuba has been substantially wrecked.

One of the most difficult questions to answer is whether or not Castro always was a Communist. In my opinion the answer is "No," although he was a socialist radical in his youth. To this day Castro is a "Fidelista," in that he believes in himself more than he does in Karl Marx.

The last time I was in Havana I was held in the house in which Mikoyan lived when he was there. You may recall that Mikoyan was kept waiting there so long that Adlai Stevenson made a comment in the United Nations that they might have to send me down to get Mikoyan out. I have an idea that I did better than Mikoyan in Havana. Any time that you read the oversimplification that Castro is merely a pawn of Soviet Russia, remember that it is simply untrue. The island of Cuba today belongs to Castro, as Khrushchev and Mikoyan have learned. His relations with Soviet Russia may be likened to a telescope. Khrushchev is looking through his end at Castro, to see how he has been using Fidel; but Fidel is looking through the other end, and he knows how he has been using Khrushchev. Castro has been playing Soviet Russia against the United States, and both against Red China, in his battle for survival.

The Communist problem exists not only in Cuba but throughout all Latin America. There is a deep-seated tendency in the United States to view vir-

tually all the earth's ills as attributable to communism. I often wonder what some of the professional anti-Communists would do if communism suddenly went away, and they had to find another dragon to slay. They are *against* communism and sin, but the question is, What are they *for*?

The fact is, in my humble opinion, while the process of ferment has been greatly accelerated due to the impetus of worldwide communism and to the emergence of Castro in Cuba, there exist the basic elements of revolution in its most alarming stages throughout the whole of Latin America today. Further, you would have it whether or not communism vanished tomorrow and whether or not Castro existed.

In order to explain those statements, I would like to set forth a few facts. If you read Dr. Milton Eisenhower's recent book, "The Wine Is Bitter," or you read any other author on the subject, you will find that whatever their judgment as to what should be done about this situation, whatever their judgment as to its origin, all will agree upon these simple, indisputable facts. I believe that we in the United States, and especially the influential business communities represented here today, at least should turn their minds at times from Berlin, Africa, or Viet-Nam, and think in factual terms of the immediate situation on the southern doorstep of our United States.

LATIN AMERICA FACTS

1. Latin America embraces twenty independent nations, including Mexico, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean Islands. It constitutes one-sixth of the earth's land surface. Brazil alone is almost as large as the United States, while Bolivia is the size of Texas and California combined.

2. There now are approximately 200 million people in Latin America.

3. The average per capita annual income throughout Latin America is \$280, and in many countries, such as Peru, it is less than \$120 per annum. In nearly all these countries less than 2 percent of the population control the majority of the wealth, and there is virtually no middle class or sound economic development within the nation.

[I would like to say at this point that one of the most startling aspects of the Castro success is that a social revolution so profound in nature could occur in Cuba, which had a relatively high standard of living and in which there exist a middle class and strong trade unions. If this happened in Cuba, I ask you to think of the potentially explosive situation in other Latin American countries.]

4. Six out of ten Latin Americans cannot read or write; in Haiti, nine out of ten. A majority of Latin American children never go beyond the second grade in school and their life expectancy is under 35 years of age.

5. In Venezuela in 1963, a man earning \$100,000 would pay \$8,000 in income taxes. Even so, not in one Latin American country today is it a criminal offense to fraudulently evade income taxes and in most countries there are not even civil penalties. Any of you with experience in Latin America would attest that, even under those ridiculous circumstances, when finally the government catches up with a delinquent taxpayer, instead of its being a question of paying the tax (even without interest) it is usually a question of how much the tax collector must be paid to forget about the entire matter.

6. Throughout Latin America, there is anti-Yankee sentiment, deep-rooted

in every stratum of society. In one country, the United States is condemned because its investments are so great that the country's politicians can shout that the United States maintains economic domination over the nation and treats it as a Yankee colony. In a neighboring country, the United States is condemned with equal vigor because it has not invested enough, and local politicians charge that we are deliberately keeping the country underdeveloped for future exploitation. In neither country can the United States win, since under either guise we are called "Yankee imperialists."

7. Latin America has the highest rate of population growth in the world, even higher than Red China. Today, its population is about the same as the United States and Canada combined. But, at the present rate of growth, toward the end of my generation the Latin American population will approximately double that of Anglo-North America, and have about 600 million people to our then 300 million.

Throughout Latin America, contrary to popular belief in the United States that there have been continual Latin American revolutions, there have been only two true revolutions with an ideological basis—those in Mexico and Cuba. All the others have been just changes in the palace guards. But in every Latin American nation, especially since the advent of Castro, there has been a dramatic stirring among the population which will continue even if communism disappears from the world. Among the poor and oppressed there has been an awakening similar to that in Africa and Asia; an urgent demand for some hope of education for one's children, a living wage, and a semblance of human dignity.

The wealthy oligarchies controlling these Latin American nations appear to be blind, not only to simple social justice but also to their own self-preservation. Almost any objective observer would advise that unless they make radical changes in their social structures; unless they adopt reasonable programs for tax and agrarian reform, public health, public education, public housing; unless they assure a living wage for those willing to work; these ruling classes are digging their own graves.

They can reply, and do so: "This is our problem, and we need no advice from Yankees. We will continue to pay laborers a wage of 40 cents a day. We will continue to oppose land reform, tax reform, public education, public health and housing. We will continue to live in the manner of sixteenth century Spanish grandees, and we will continue to keep unnecessary armies which are not here for the country's self-defense, but to help us preserve our preserves." Yet, our proper concern in Hartford, Chicago, San Francisco, or New York, is not whether these rulers are simply digging their own graves, but whether they are not also digging ours.

The whole of Latin America has always been a special target of Red China. In the United States, the question is always asked me, for example, "How many Russians are in Cuba?" No one asks, what in my opinion is the more important question, "How many Red Chinese are in Cuba?" The answer is: The number is big in Cuba, and it is dangerous, because Premier Castro thus far has carefully avoided siding with Russia in her political conflict with Red China. In Cuba's present planning, especially in agricultural development and economic diversification, Red China is a major if not dominant factor. You may recall that a spokesman for our own State Department has declared that while Castro needs Russia for his stomach, his heart is with Red China.

I say to you, in conclusion, that the tragedy of Cuba and the present

plight of the Cuban people under the regime of Castro will be duplicated throughout Latin America in undoubtedly more violent form than we have seen, and in the immediate future, unless reform in the true sense of social justice is effected before revolution.

The Alliance for Progress has been a step in the right direction. However, my judgment is that the best solution is not going to come through our government making funds available to the present Latin American governments, when it is demonstrable that a majority of the funds do not even remain in those countries for their economic development but wind up in numbered Swiss bank accounts.

The solution should and will lie with American business, our private enterprise, operating throughout Latin America with joint ventures planned by American businessmen filled with a social conscience to the extent of seeing that every native Latin worker earns a fair living wage and receives decent housing, health, and education. There must be an equitable distribution of invested wealth to remain in those countries, for the benefit of both managerial and working classes, and applied to the Latin nations' social and economic development. Our investors, on the other hand, must be guaranteed protection of their capital, plus a fair return over a thirty-year period.

This is the only manner in which, in our time, we will see realized what must be the ultimate objective of us all, in Latin America but also in the rest of the world—the establishment of an international rule of law and Catholic social justice under God.

Physical Fitness for National Strength

RALPH OWENS

Director, Physical Fitness Program, Archdiocese of Detroit

OUR GOVERNMENT under our late President Kennedy, who inspired so many of us in physical fitness work, became concerned about the softness of the American youth, and is looking to the schools to have a program which will help all students attain a high degree of fitness, with special attention being given to those students who are physically undeveloped. I blame Sputnik for helping to increase the physical softness of our American youth. The school people became alarmed and had meeting after meeting to toughen up the curriculum "to catch up with Russia." Now, we are having meeting after meeting on what to do with the dropouts. We frown on sending them to salt mines in Siberia, but we need to stop and consider what makes a good citizen. There has been a tendency to overlook the health of the students. I would like to quote a paragraph written by the late President Kennedy in an article that appeared in *Sports Illustrated*, July 16, 1962:

When a citizen of Greece returned home after a victory in the Olympic Games, he was escorted triumphantly into the city through a hole which had been ripped in its wall. Thus, the city-state was symbolically assured that any polis possessed of such a hero had no need of a wall to defend it. Although we may be sure that

the wall was repaired when a hostile army threatened, that symbolic act had a meaning which is as true for the American of today as it was for the ancient Greeks, a meaning expressed by Disraeli when he said, "The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depend."

In most Catholic school systems, the gifted youngsters have an outstanding program in competitive athletics. We are not in favor of deemphasizing athletics; however, a physical fitness education program should come first. We are not doing the job if we believe that our athletic program is sufficient, nor is your coach doing his job if he is just throwing out some balls.

We have too little physical activity for other students, especially girls. Our young ladies will be better mothers and better nuns if we can make them physical-fitness conscious. There are several convents in Detroit that have regular daily physical exercises now.

The way of life which consists of automation, gadgets, electric toothbrushes, electric can openers, TV, and automobiles has increased the tensions and emotions of the youth of today so that they, more than ever, need at least 15 minutes of daily vigorous activity as suggested by the Council on Youth Fitness.

We school people should accept the responsibility of doing something about it. While the classroom is most important, the lawyer, the scientist, the doctor, the priest, the nun, the truck driver cannot be at his best unless he is physically fit, nor can the United States of America be at its best unless the nation is physically fit: the late John F. Kennedy pointed this out time after time. Did you know that one-half of our 18-year-olds are unfit for military duty?

We are looking for a sound mind in a sound body. There isn't a great danger of your careers or my career being interrupted by an epidemic disease such as TB, pneumonia, smallpox, and so forth; but there is a danger of it being interrupted by a heart attack, or just plain fatigue, or lack of ambition. Exercise is needed to prevent this. I read that our great music conductors live longer, and this is attributed to the fact of the constant moving of the arms up and down—exercise.

The President's Council on Youth Fitness has made it easier for schools that lack money, facilities, and personnel, to have a physical fitness program. They have published the *Blue Book*, which is simple and easy to follow. Physical fitness is not controversial—you can't get anyone to say that we should be physically unfit.

There is no doubt we are going to have to move ahead in the field of science, in language, engineering, math, but along with all of this there must be an effort to make sure we are physically fit—if we are a sick people, we are going to have trouble walking to the engineering lab or the missile pad. Then twenty years from now, when a 25-hour-week might be a reality, if the people of this country, with all of this leisure time, do not have a sound mind in a sound body, they may resort to a life that would weaken our nation seriously.

We in the Archdiocese of Detroit are attempting to meet this challenge so that we will have the satisfaction of helping America become a better nation.

Monsignor Vincent J. Horkan, Superintendent of Schools for the Archdiocese of Detroit, long ago recognized the need for a physical fitness program in our Catholic schools. The responsibility was given to me. This certainly was a challenge on how to approach a school system of 108 high schools and

259 grade schools, with 201,000 students, and with schools spread out over 5,374 square miles, a lot of them with very limited facilities.

We have always been proud of our inter-school competitive program, and have organized leagues and teams in football, basketball, baseball, swimming, hockey, tennis, cross-country, spring track, wrestling, bowling, and rifling. The gifted athlete in the Detroit Catholic school system certainly has been provided for. What we wanted was "balance," something for the other 70 percent which would help our students become physically fit and physically-fit-conscious. Our competitive athletic program continues.

There were many hurdles to be overcome. Lack of money, space, equipment, trained personnel, and possibly teacher and parent opposition. I would like to point out that much improvement was and is needed; but we have many high schools and grade schools which have had for a long time outstanding physical education programs, with excellent and qualified physical education teachers. The biggest problem, we felt, was to get the religious and lay teachers interested in a physical fitness program where none existed. We invited all teachers, religious and lay, to a physical fitness clinic for the purposes of showing a need for such a program, with simple instructions on how it could be started. At this clinic, at the beginning of the school year, we suggested that the President's Council on Youth Fitness *Manual* be used as a guide for unqualified teachers in our school system. At the clinic we examined the Youth Physical Fitness *Blue Book* thoroughly with the 900 nuns in attendance and 100 lay teachers. We explained to them how to give the exercises and tests, no matter how limited the space. We had grade and high school students demonstrating the tests and exercises that were recommended as a beginning for a program and other activities to supplement the *Blue Book*. We emphasized that trained personnel should be hired to conduct this program; but, if this was not possible, the nuns, priests, parents, and the gifted athletes could all help in initiating this physical fitness program—or playing records can be purchased that do everything; no leader is necessary. Realizing that to find a time, especially on the grade-school level, to put it in the regular school program might be a problem, we made suggestions that it could be done at recess, at noon, in the classroom after school, on Saturdays, or in some parishes at night. It was also pointed out to those in attendance at the clinic that credit should be given on report cards, and periodic test results should be sent home to the parents. Also, a special program on physical fitness might be conducted as part of a PTA program.

Shown at this clinic was a film prepared by the Equitable Life Insurance Company for the Council on Youth Fitness, which was very well received. The local newspapers also carried articles on the program and one of our schools appeared on TV. To follow up this clinic our office had forms printed that could be used for grade-school students, and sent home, with a minimum amount of record keeping by the instructors. We had a printed master instructor sheet which we hoped would speed up record keeping on each individual.

The response to our questionnaire sent out to the schools has been overwhelming. We have up to date more than 200 schools with physical fitness programs. Our school officials, nuns, priests, brothers, and laymen are wholeheartedly for this program and very enthused about doing their share in helping American children become more physically fit. After seeing what can be done under many handicaps, and with the receptiveness that the parents and public now have toward physical fitness, we have a wonderful

opportunity to meet national needs. I would like to point out that in every situation we do not have an ideal program as yet, but, because of the nuns' cooperation we have a good start.

Our plans for the future include other clinics, mainly for those who have programs and wish to supplement their activities. We, also, are going out to the individual schools to give aid and to observe and get new ideas from the persons teaching physical fitness. Special certificates for outstanding students have been printed and are available at our office. The marines have been invited to test students in our schools.

The student reaction has been most favorable. It has been brought to our attention that voluntarily a lot of students are doing "homework" in physical fitness. The teachers tell us that they are in a better frame of mind for school work during the day. Some of our athletic coaches remark that they are getting more students out for athletic teams because of the program. Some students have decided on pursuing physical education as a career. In the *Detroit News*, an article appeared in the Sunday, February 9, 1964, edition: "That in 1958 one child in three was considered a disadvantaged child. The symptoms of the culturally deprived child or the socially disadvantaged child are common, officials say. He is starved socially, educationally, and in terms of the ingredients necessary to instill him with ambition, motivation and success. He grows up conditioned to failure."

I believe that all students need the experience of succeeding in something or improving in something so they will become better citizens of tomorrow. You will be amazed at what this will do for students both physically and mentally.

I don't believe that our Catholic school people are aware of the many services that are available through their local health agencies for the asking that would be of great help in promoting better health, such as your TB, cancer, heart associations, and City Health Department. They conduct demonstrations, obtain speakers, movies, teaching aids, et cetera.

I would like to point out this is not a one-man project, but help from many is needed, especially from our own teachers who want to put this over despite the many demands the classroom teachers are under today. If this enthusiasm continues, we have accepted our responsibility to American youth.

I realize that you teachers and administrators certainly have a full day now, and lots of groups are asking that we put their ideas in, but, outside of being in the State of Sanctifying Grace, what is more important than good health? And isn't it impossible to have a great country without it? Throughout history, your great nations, your successful nations have been nations that are happy. It is difficult for a nation that is unemployed, uneducated, and has poor health to be happy.

Calvin Coolidge said nothing in the world can take the place of persistence. Talent will not; nothing is more common than unsuccessful men with talent. Genius will not; the world is full of educated derelicts. Persistence and determination alone are omnipotent. The slogan "press on" has solved and will always solve the problems of the human race.

What Are the Facts? A Progress Report on the Study of Catholic Education

REGINALD A. NEUWEIN

*Director, Study of Catholic Education,
University of Notre Dame*

DURING THE PAST TWENTY MONTHS it has been my privilege to have been associated with the Study of Catholic Education and I sometimes forget that some of the people to whom I speak are not thoroughly aware of the study and its activities. Perhaps a brief review is indicated.

The stated purpose of the study is to gather a body of basic information about Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States. The study was established because there was no such general accumulation of knowledge about these schools. In character, the study is neither evaluative nor comparative, although the findings, which are now being developed, could be used in future evaluative and comparative studies.

Our activities are based at the University of Notre Dame and are financed by a \$350,000.00 Carnegie Corporation grant. The professional staff is responsible to a supervisory committee consisting of Father Theodore Hesburgh, President of the University of Notre Dame; Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, Executive Secretary of NCEA; and Dr. George Shuster, Assistant to the President of Notre Dame.

In order to achieve our purpose, the study procedure was divided into two major activities: 1) Activities related to all Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States; 2) Activities related to thirteen selected dioceses and archdioceses.

To accomplish the national purpose, a series of three questionnaires was developed to cover the individual faculty members, the individual elementary school, and the individual secondary school. Each of the schedules was developed to gather meaningful information about the people who operate and service the schools, and about the schools in which Catholic youth are brought together with their teachers.

The first finding was our identification of the cooperative character of teachers and administrators in Catholic schools through the return rate of our schedules. I think the following analysis of our returns is significant.

	<i>Total Possible</i>	<i>Actual Returns</i>	<i>Return Percentage</i>
Elementary faculty	112,101	103,779	92.6
Secondary faculty	46,880	39,809	84.9
Elementary schools	10,633	9,451	88.9
Secondary schools	2,502	2,075	82.9

At the present time we have practically completed the processing of all the national data. Each set of data can be produced for the United States,

by standard statistical regions, for a single diocese or any combination of dioceses, for a single school or a group of schools, or by types of schools according to ownership or administrative organization. A program is now being developed which will process the data by religious communities; this would not be for use of the study, but for the possible use of individual religious communities.

It might be interesting to look at some of the items which are raw products and not developed by relationship with other items.

1. The lay to religious ratio in the elementary schools, on a national basis, is 1 lay teacher to 2.24 religious teachers. In looking at the report by statistical regions, this same ratio is lowest in Region 1 (New England) where it is 1 lay teacher to 6.4 religious teachers. It is highest in Region 7 (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas) where it is 1 lay teacher to 1.3 religious teachers. In the secondary schools, this ratio on a national basis is 1 lay teacher to 2.64 religious teachers. In Region 1, it is lowest at 1 lay teacher to 4.6 religious teachers and in Region 6 (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi) it is highest at 1 lay teacher to 1.9 religious teachers.
2. In the elementary schools, the median of the sisters' age is 39, but the largest group (28.6 percent) is between 25 years and 34 years.
3. The sisters teaching in the elementary schools are better trained than the lay teachers in the same schools. While 56 percent of the sisters have bachelor's degrees or better, only 33 percent of the lay teachers have this same training level.
4. Of the 10,285 lay teachers in the elementary schools, who have degrees, 52 percent received their degrees from Catholic colleges. In the secondary schools, 9,406 lay teachers have degrees and 58 percent received their degrees from Catholic colleges.

These items are not presented because of their earth-shaking significance, but only as indications of the many hundreds of meaningful items which are available and which are being exploited for their full worth and are being explored for the meaning in back of them.

In the intensive studies of thirteen diocesan organizations, 322 schools were studied in depth. These schools included 218 elementary and 104 secondary schools which are identified as sample schools.

Diocesan School Visitation

As an important part of the intensive studies, 102 highly qualified educators visited as observers in the sample schools. In preparation for their work, the observers were given a day of group orientation to the study program and to the Visiting Guide which was used in each school. The information gathered in each school and the observations made were recorded in the Visiting Guides. At the end of each diocesan visiting period all visitors met for a full day of summary work, during which a group summary was drawn and this with the individual Visiting Guides became the source data of the study staff. During the visitations the teams had at least one, and usually two or three observers, who had worked on previous teams. The teams for the first two diocesan visitations consisted of permanent Study staff members.

In passing, it might be interesting to note that Study teams always had

some religious and some lay members but not in any strict ratio; also, almost every team had non-Catholic representation within its membership—the lay section, that is.

Analysis Workshop

During the first two weeks of August, 1963, an analysis workshop was conducted in order to digest and abstract the materials produced by the visitation teams. These materials represented a few less than 100 secondary schools and approximately 180 elementary schools.

The workshop was broken into two sections—elementary and secondary. The elementary section worked independently for the first five days in digesting the elementary materials and spent the sixth day in joint meetings with the secondary section. During this joint meeting the elementary people shared their experiences with the secondary staff. On the seventh day the elementary people completed their reports; and the secondary people began their work of digesting the secondary materials, and continued through the fifteenth day of the workshop. The written product of the workshop and the original source materials from the school visitations are the research data being used by the study staff.

The analysis workshop staff consisted of six members in each section. By design, four of the section members had participated in at least one diocesan visitation, and the other two members had skills and qualifications similar to the first four, but they had not previously participated in the study.

ELEMENTARY SECTION

SISTER JEAN CLARE, O.P., Curriculum Coordinator, Rockville Centre, Long Island, New York

SISTER MARIA CONCEPTA, C.S.C., doctoral candidate, part-time study staff

MRS. ELEANOR KENNARD, former elementary principal, Stamford, Connecticut

DR. MARY LOUISE MOLYNEAUX, elementary school principal, Pittsburgh Public Schools

*DR. EARL A. MCGOVERN, Assistant Superintendent, New Rochelle, New York, Public Schools

*SISTER MARY GERTRUDE, S.L., principal, Elementary Division, St. Mary's Academy, Denver, Colorado

SECONDARY SECTION

BROTHER JOHN DARBY, S.M., Supervisor of Schools, New York Province, Society of Mary

SISTER MARY GEMMA, H.H.M., Directress of Education, Villa Maria Convent, Villa Maria, Pennsylvania

*BROTHER JOHN DRISCOLL, C.S.C., Director of Education, Holy Cross Brothers, Mid-West Province

DR. EDWARD GRIFFIN, Dean of the School of Education, University of San Francisco, California

*DR. RAYMOND MCCOY, Dean of the Graduate School, Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio

DR. JOSEPH McLAUGHLIN, Director of Teacher Training, Providence College, Rhode Island

*Not previously connected with the study.

Additional Diocesan School Visitation

During October and November, 1963, the visitation program in the Diocese of Mobile-Birmingham was completed and the previous visitations in the Archdioceses of Chicago and New York were expanded and supplemented. These three visitations programs consumed six work weeks of study staff time.

Ability and Achievement—Elementary

The source materials for the students' ability and achievement tests have been collected from grades 2, 4, 6, and 8 in the sample schools. The results have been coded and a computer program is being developed which is aimed at identifying the characteristics of schools which produce various quality-level results.

Ability and Achievement—Secondary

The materials which were collected from the sample secondary schools made it very clear that there were insufficient common factors in secondary-school testing programs which could be used comparatively either on an intra- or inter-diocesan basis. (This is related to the autonomous character of the secondary schools and the low availability of secondary-school testing programs.) To meet this pressing study need, the staff selected a secondary-school testing program consisting of an achievement battery and a mental ability indicator. This program was administered in 5 dioceses, covering 44 schools, and a total of 8,400 twelfth-graders. The results will be evaluated in terms of school characteristics.

Inventory of Religious Outcomes (I.R.O.)

The instrument was administered to 14,819 students at the eighth- and twelfth-grade levels in the sample schools of the representative dioceses. A brief statement related to each of the three parts of this inventory is presented below.

Part I. RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGES and UNDERSTANDINGS. In this section of the inventory, students answer fifty questions about creed, commandments, and sacraments. Their answers reflect how much and how well they know Catholic theory and practices related to theory. Further, for each of the fifty items the student selects his answer from three answers which are correct and two other alternatives which are incorrect. In developing the test, a jury of three theologians judged the three correct approaches to each item to be defensibly Catholic, and markedly distinctive from one another. These three approaches are identified as "progressive," "moderate," and "conservative."

In addition to the test design, the background characteristics of each student who has taken the inventory will be used in the analyses.

Part II. STUDENT ATTITUDE INDEX. One of the prime functions of Catholic schools is to influence attitudes. Consequently, the study staff developed, through extensive pre-testing, an instrument to test differences of attitudes. Thirty experts in education helped to prune a long list of items developed from an exploration of related literature and from staff discussions. Field pre-testing aided formalizing the final 55 questions which were carefully centered on basic dimensions of attitudes: religious-moral; occupational; social-civic; and family. The instrument was included in the I. R. O. and adminis-

tered to the students covered by that instrument. The 1,499 returns from one diocese have been run on the 1620 computer producing two-way tables, 110 correlation ratios, and 107 chi-square tests, and simple coefficients of contingency. Analysis of these results is in progress, already suggesting valuable insights. For example, percentage replies to the statement: "*Even when there are serious difficulties in the family, I still believe that divorce with remarriage is always wrong,*" arrange themselves in the following manner:

	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Uncertain</i>	<i>Disagree</i>
Catholic high schools	261(81%)	10(3%)	51(16%) N-322
Catholic elementary	638(79%)	48(6%)	121(15%) N-807
C. C. D. high school	94(75%)	4(3%)	27(22%) N-125
C. C. D. elementary	150(68%)	18(8%)	53(24%) N-221

A chi-square test shows that this distribution could happen by chance only 1 time out of 100. Also, seven scales have been developed from the data, and currently some planning has started in the direction of multiple factor analysis. The cards for the other twelve dioceses are ready for processing and the system that was developed on this one diocese will be applied to all dioceses.

Part III. STUDENT OPINIONNAIRE. Within the Inventory of Religious Outcomes was included a set of 23 questions designed to surface student views about the school situations which they were experiencing. Considerable pre-testing indicated that eighth- and twelfth-grade children could respond with understanding to such questions as:

Why are you going to a Catholic school?

What subjects attract you most?

What do you like or dislike most about your school?

How do you evaluate the study of religion?

What occupational goals do you have?

How much more schooling do you really expect?

The purposes of this instrument center on determining whether eighth- and twelfth-grade students show significant differences in understanding, appreciation, and goal-oriented activity in their schools. It also becomes important to know the comparative impact of different categories of schools—for example, rural, suburban, urban, large-small, ethnic differences. In general, this probing reveals evidence of the social climate of students who have had a number of years of experience in a given kind of school. Data from one diocese have been given first-stage analysis and the successful procedures will be applied to the other twelve dioceses.

Parents' Expectations

Twenty-six thousand parents of first-, sixth-, eighth-, and twelfth-grade students completed a structured questionnaire in which they rated each of thirty-one specific goals of Catholic schools according to importance, and they also evaluated the degree to which they believed these goals were being met. Approximately 20 percent of these parents responded to an open-ended invitation to make additional comments, and 9 out of 10 of these comments were positive and constructive.

Other Depth-Study Activities

A follow-up of the college-bound high school graduates in the 104 sample secondary schools was conducted affecting the June graduates of 1956 and 1958. Returns have been made by just above 50 percent of the schools. The percentage of return was low because many schools did not have record information to determine which graduates actually entered specific colleges.

An academic inventory is being submitted to the sample secondary schools to determine the extent of the curriculum offering, the student participation in it, and the success of the varying ability-level students with the curriculum offering.

As of this date, the activities of the study staff are concentrated on processing the massive accumulation of data and on interpretation of the broad findings which have been produced. It is the staff aim to complete all of the processing work by June, 1964, and to finish the assembling of all findings by October, 1964.

I am frequently asked to summarize our findings to date. In broad terms, against my previous experiences, I have found that Catholic schools, in terms of quality, represent the highest levels of excellence and also represent some low-quality levels. I would expect to find a similar situation in any large group of representative schools.

Some of the quality indicators which we have identified include:

1. Adoption and adaptation of curriculum change in both the elementary and secondary schools, including modern mathematics at both levels; new approaches to the biological and physical sciences in the secondary schools; introduction of modern language instruction in the elementary schools.
2. The utilization of new educational technology at both school levels, such as televised instruction; laboratory equipment in languages, and in reading; and a wide variety of visual aids.
3. New approaches to staff utilization are being developed in a good number of the secondary schools by use of the concepts of team teaching, large-group instruction, small laboratory and seminar groups, ability grouping, and differentiated curriculum offerings.
4. Many variations of the nongraded approach are in operation in the elementary schools.
5. We know of one Catholic high school which is developing a plan to operate as a nongraded high school.

Some of the inhibitors to quality which have been identified include:

1. In the elementary schools, approximately 62 percent of the school principals have full-time teaching duties and another 13 percent have part-time teaching duties. This situation is directly related to the size of the schools—71 percent of the elementary schools have fewer than 12 rooms.
2. The twelfth-grade enrollment in 43 percent of the secondary schools was less than 38 students. This situation would make it difficult to provide a broad curriculum offering.
3. In 44 percent of the secondary schools, no time provision is made for the guidance function and in an additional 16 percent of the schools less than half of one staff member's time is released for guidance.
4. The lack of clerical assistance in both the elementary and secondary schools forces some professional staff member to execute even the mini-

mal administrative detail. In 86 percent of the elementary schools no clerical service is available and this same situation is true in 54 percent of the secondary schools.

It should be observed here that the presence of quality indicators does not ensure quality in every instance and, by the same token, quality inhibitors are frequently overcome by the efforts of school staffs.

Catholic schools today are surrounded with a frenetic climate. From all sides come newly stated interests in these schools ranging from the quality and effectiveness of the schools, to their purpose and need for existence; the elimination of certain grade segments, to the elimination of all elementary and secondary schools; the place of the nun in the school, to the place of the nun in the world; the labeling of Catholic thinking as "siege" or "ghetto," to plans for increasing religious vocations.

As I enter this melee, I know I do so with convictions, as have the other entrants to the fray. I believe that Catholic schools are good and they should not be fragmented in hysteria.

My thesis is proposed for formal and concerted consideration by the Catholic hierarchy, the Catholic clergy and religious, and the Catholic laity. This proposal could be considered on a national basis and then on a regional basis to be referred back to the national level for conclusion.

Presented in a problem-solving format, my proposal is as follows:

1. Is a formally organized program for the religious development of Catholic youth
 - a) good?
 - b) desirable?
 - c) necessary?
2. Should such a program be provided for
 - a) all Catholic youth?
 - b) some Catholic youth?
 - c) if some, which?
3. Is the Catholic school, as now organized and structured, the way in which religious development can best be promoted?
4. If not, what is the solution?
5. If selective admissions, elimination of grade segments, or containment of expansion are to be considered as solutions, and this curtailment is based on the supposition that the laity is unable or unwilling to support a full program of Catholic schools, these hypotheses should be tested or they become merely assumptions.
6. If these solutions are based wholly or in part on an inadequate supply of religious, this problem should be thoroughly explored. Involved here would be: expanded use of lay teachers, full and part-time; exploitation of shared-time programs; more effective staff-utilization; promotion of the lay volunteer in the schools.

What's New in Significant Research and Experimentation in Catholic Elementary Education?

SISTER MARY RICHARDINE, B.V.M.

*Associate Secretary, Elementary School Department,
National Catholic Educational Association*

FOR THE PAST HOUR or so we have listened to preliminary reports on two very important pieces of research in the field of Catholic education. They represent a large investment—perhaps a half-million dollars all told. The investigations have been conducted by teams of people, with varying backgrounds in the fields being researched. A variety of research instruments have been and are being used in an effort to obtain as honest and as objective a picture of Catholic education as it is humanly possible to discover. Realizing how many intangible, but extremely significant, educational outcomes seem to elude all attempts at measurement, we can appreciate the difficulties which confront even the most objective researcher. At least such difficulties apparently exist at the present time, as far as the availability of research instruments is concerned, judging from responses of Educational Testing Service specialists to requests for such instruments for other programs of evaluation.

The final results of the studies at Notre Dame and the National Opinion Research Center may give a more or a less encouraging picture of Catholic education than those we have had shown to us today. It is for us as Catholic educators to use the results of all pertinent research to build up our strengths and to remedy, and whenever possible completely to eradicate, our weaknesses. In either case, this is no small task. We are living in an age when the problems confronting educators are much more complex than they have been in ages past. Developments in technology have, for better and at times for worse, brought all parts of the world and every type of political, social, and moral problem right into our classrooms and into the very homes of the children whom we teach.

In his article on "The Changing Curriculum of America's Schools," in the November 16, 1963, *Saturday Review*, John Goodlad brought us face to face with the fact that the accretion of knowledge, especially in the natural and behavioural sciences, since the time of Christ creates problems for educators of a kind that never before existed. "If this accumulation is plotted on a time line," Goodlad writes, "beginning with the birth of Christ, it is estimated that the first doubling of knowledge occurred in 1750, the second in 1900, the third in 1950, and the fourth in 1960."

It is not hard to see that administration, supervision, and curriculum planning for today's schools must of necessity be quite different from the planning done a quarter of a century or even a decade ago. It seems equally apparent that research and experimentation must be recognized as essential adjuncts to this planning.

The findings of the Notre Dame and the National Opinion Research Center

studies will be used to fullest advantage by forward-looking Catholic educators both in immediate and long-range planning for our schools. (Obviously, in spite of some rather recent publications, I do expect the parochial school will continue to exist and to flourish, thanks to you and to thousands of other dedicated Catholic educators, religious and lay, whose lifeblood is flowing through every vein of our Catholic school system.) And other data, besides those from Notre Dame and the University of Chicago, are available as a result of research and experimentation being conducted on a much smaller scale and usually without benefit of foundation support; these findings, too, have meaning for our Catholic school educators. I refer to studies and experiments which have been and are being made by the National Catholic Educational Association, by diocesan school systems, by private colleges and universities, and by individual scholars. Within the limits of time allowed, I shall endeavor to give reports on as wide a range of these studies as possible, and shall make passing reference to others in this discussion of "What's New in Significant Research and Experimentation in Catholic Elementary Education."

CURRICULUM RANKING IN SRA PLACEMENT TESTS

While I am averse to making comparisons between public and parochial schools, or, for that matter, between parochial schools in this part of the country and those in any other part of it because there are so many uncontrolled variables which may alter the picture in one way or another, I believe it is advisable to quote the study of Robert H. Bauernfiend and Warren S. Blumenfeld on "A Comparison of Achievement Scores of Public School and Catholic School Pupils." My reason for doing so is a statement by Martin Mayer in the January 31, 1964, issue of *Commonweal* (Vol. LXXIX, No. 18). And I quote: "... the Catholic schools seem to be a depressed area in American education. By whatever objective measurements we can make, they rank well below the public schools of their areas. Less money is spent per pupil, class sizes are substantially larger, there are fewer teachers per thousand pupils, and the teachers themselves are typically less well prepared (which is saying a good deal)" (page 529).

It would take more time than I now have to answer Mr. Mayer's charges in their entirety, and there are some of them which are certainly true; however, it does seem that when we talk about objective measurement where education is concerned, records of academic achievement should be included. Bauernfiend and Blumenfeld report on comparative performance of eighth-grade public and Catholic school students who took SRA High School Placement Tests in 1959 and 1960, in the Summer 1963 issue of the journal *Educational and Psychological Measurement* (Vol. 23, pp. 331 ff.). This report indicates that the SRA High School Placement Tests were administered to both groups in the spring of each year. Test records for 1959 were available for 80,000 public school children and for 60,000 Catholic school children. Using a sample of 1,000 pupils from each group, matched on the variables of geographic regions, sex, and performance on the Non-Verbal Reasoning Score, the researchers found that the Catholic school group scored a mean grade equivalent to 1.0 years higher than the public school sample.

The 1960 test was administered to 120,000 public school pupils and to 100,000 Catholic school children. The same sampling procedure was used as with the 1959 test. Results on the three achievement tests in language

arts, arithmetic, and reading showed that the Catholic school students scored 0.45 years higher. The authors of the report stated: "It is important to note that these broad findings would not necessarily apply to any given local group of parochial-school and public-school children. But, on a national basis, circa 1960, Catholic-school eighth grade groups showed significantly higher levels of achievement in three curriculum areas than did public-school eighth grade groups" (*Ibid.*, p. 335).

As I said in introducing this research, I am averse to such comparisons for the reasons which I stated, but to put Mr. Mayer's record straight, I felt obliged to present the findings of the Bauernfiend and Blumenfeld study.

Since apart from the child himself the teacher is the most important person on the educational scene, research on "Job Satisfaction of Lay and Religious Teachers in Catholic Elementary Schools" is pertinent and significant. Results of a study by Sister Mary Georgita, B.V.M., were reported in a 1963 dissertation at the University of Chicago. Some of the major conclusions are:

1. The leader behavior of the principal is a crucial factor contributing to the satisfaction of lay teachers and religious teachers in Catholic elementary schools. . . .
2. Differences exist between groups in spiritual incentives, but both lay and religious teachers are motivated by a sense of "mission" in their work. . . . Lay teachers are of necessity motivated by economic incentives which are related to their satisfaction. . . .
3. This [the lay teachers' contingent role of teaching] results in a great turnover among lay faculty and recruitment of young and inexperienced persons. Commitment to education is naturally lower for these teachers than it is for sisters.
4. Both religious and lay groups demonstrated that being encouraged to take part in faculty meetings contributed to their satisfaction. Lay teachers in this study tended to be encouraged to take part in faculty meetings to a lesser degree than sisters.

There is always a risk involved in quoting excerpts from any study which do not give the writer's interpretations of statements made. Yet, the implications of what we have been able to give from Sister Mary Georgita's research seem important both for our Catholic elementary school administrators and teachers.

NCEA SURVEY OF PRESSING ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

Some of the most pressing administrative problems in Catholic elementary schools in recent years have related to class size, use of double sessions, and dropped grades. Final results on NCEA studies currently under way are not yet available, but with data now at hand we can give a fairly accurate picture of directions in which schools and dioceses seem to be moving in seeking solutions to these problems. On the question of class size, comparative data for 1961 and 1963 show improvement in class size and teacher-pupil ratios during this two-year period nationally: in urban dioceses, where the problem was most acute, and also in rural areas, as well as in all major geographic sections of the country. In the Middle Atlantic area, where the class-size

situation was the worst in the national picture in 1961, and in the predominantly rural Southeast, West North Central, and Southwest sections of the country where the 1961 record for parochial school class size was best, the 1963 survey shows continuing improvement. Preliminary 1963 figures show that nationally there are 9 percent more classes with less than 45 pupils than was the case in 1961. One new teacher for every 18.5 new pupils is the very latest figure obtained. This is also reflected in reduced class size statistics already given—but this has not been at the price of any loss in total enrollment.

Reports on the use of double sessions indicate that in the dioceses which have returned this information to date, there are 37,329 out of 4,241,672 students in the schools who are on double sessions. The questionnaire did not specify that kindergartens, which are frequently on double sessions because of the immaturity of the children involved rather than because of staff or space problems, should be excluded. The figure quoted above, therefore, may possibly include some kindergarten children among those on double sessions. Data reported here were supplied by 130 dioceses. Nine of the remaining eleven dioceses had no classes on double sessions in 1961, and only 6 of the 485 schools in the other two dioceses had any double sessions. With this as the national picture, it seems justifiable to report considerable improvement for the country as a whole in this problem area for the 1963-64 school year.

A third NCEA study in process is investigating the number of schools that have dropped any grades since September, 1959. Data for this study, as for the others already reported, are being obtained from the October 1963 Statistical Questionnaire on Elementary Schools of NCWC's Department of Education. Results show that in the 130 of the 141 dioceses which have reported to date there are 10,021 schools, 154 of which have dropped some grade or other than kindergarten during the past four years. Seven additional schools have dropped kindergarten. First grade was most frequently dropped—by 112 schools; second grade was next most frequently dropped—by 55 schools; grades three to eight were dropped by 33, 28, 30, 28, 34, and 30 schools respectively, giving the total of 161 schools which had dropped any grades since 1959. Of the 130 reporting dioceses, only 43 reported dropping any grades other than kindergarten. Since this survey was made, the Archdiocese of Cincinnati has announced its intention of dropping first grade in all schools of the Archdiocese for the 1964-65 school year. We have no indication at present that any other dioceses contemplate such a move.

The NCEA studies just reported all relate to problems of staff and plant utilization as well as to finance. Catholic school administrators harassed by these problems will be interested in the experiment at Redemptorist Diocesan Junior High School in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The February 21, 1964, issue of *The Commentator*, (Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 1, 10), carries the story of this school which was dedicated on February 25 of this year. The diocese has given a portion of the supporting or construction funds, with the major portion coming from the eleven parishes within the consolidated area, which will maintain only the first through sixth grades in their parochial schools and will form the board of the junior high school. Redemptorist Junior High has its own physical facilities in a completely separate building with its own administration and staff distinct from the senior high school, which, how-

ever, is located on the same grounds. The junior high school program is fully departmentalized with an enrichment program over and above the regular curriculum. Many of you are now undoubtedly asking, with me, if the diocesan junior high school will ever become an organizational pattern in our Catholic school system.

NONGRADED PROGRAMS—A CONTINUING EXPERIMENT

Another kind of experimentation is the nongraded program which is moving ahead under diocesan sponsorship in a growing number of dioceses. The Pittsburgh program, spearheaded, we might say, by the St. Louis experiment which dates back to 1953, is reported in a Fordham University doctoral dissertation by Sister Mary Paul, R.S.M., from Mount Mercy College in Pittsburgh. The St. Louis nongraded primary was reported in a doctoral study at St. Louis University by Sister Mary Bernarda, C.P.P.S., in 1958. The fact that Pittsburgh is considering experimentation with nongraded classes on the secondary level seems to indicate satisfaction with results to date in the elementary school experimental program.

Sister Mary Alice, R.S.M., director of the Center for Liberal Studies at St. Xavier College in Chicago, has given us a summary of a longitudinal study of the nongraded program.

The nongraded program has been in effect at Christ the King School for eight years with all the real problems of orienting faculty, expanding enrollment, and providing materials for all levels. Faculty and administration are still enthusiastic about the plan because by it they see provision for individual differences which make the teaching job easier.

Regarding the slower learners, it has been observed that allowing them to move more slowly during the first year or two obviates failure, attendant negative attitudes, and frequently results in "catching up" to the age group by the end of the primary. Of the original experimental group, 13 of the total 73 took four years to complete the usual three-year primary program. However, all of these were able to complete the usual eight-year elementary program in eight years. By that time, two had transferred. Three of the remaining 11 were in the upper third of the class and 7 were at least a year above grade level.

For the brighter student: 18 of the original 73 finished in seven years. (Three more were academically able but either parents or school recommended extending the elementary school program. Such decision is made at the end of the fifth year so that provision can be made for enrichment or extension of the usual program during the three years.)

Of the 18 who finished in seven years, 13 were girls and 5 were boys. Seventy-seven percent of the girls were in the 90 percentile of the National Educational Development Test. The boys high schools did not administer any standardized test for comparison. All students but four were in the upper half of their class.

Sister concluded her report on this study with the statement: "In general, the change in organizational structure does not, in itself, improve the achievement of all ability levels but does seem to provide for the extremes." Also included with Sister Mary Alice's report was a summary of a study on reading achievement of sixth-grade nongraded and sixth-grade graded students, but time does not permit elaborating on the findings.

SUPERVISION—KEY TO IMPROVED INSTRUCTION

The nongraded school is one of the many-faceted problems of educational administration. Closely related to these problems are those in the area of supervision. The Phi Delta Kappan list of doctoral research in this field includes a study by Sister Mary Gerald Sacco, presently under way at Fordham University, which is investigating "The Role of the Community Supervisor in Catholic Elementary Schools in Selected Areas in the United States." Sister Mary Gerard, S.C.C., researched "The Role of the Community Supervisor: Expectations, Conflict, and Conflict Resolution" in a 1961 doctoral study at The Catholic University of America. In 1962, likewise at Catholic University, the Reverend Daniel Brent completed a master's dissertation on "A Study of the Organization for Supervision of Elementary Schools in Diocesan School Systems."

Examining just one item in Father Brent's study, we find that 10 percent of the supervisors represented in the study had doctoral degrees, 78 percent had master's degrees, and 12 percent had bachelor's degrees; 41 percent of the supervisors, including almost all holding the bachelor's degree, reported additional college courses over and above those represented by the held degree. According to Father Brent's research, the typical supervisor for Catholic elementary schools has a master's degree or its equivalent, has had twenty-three years of teaching experience, six years of experience as a principal, and six years of experience as a supervisor.

The Loretto Heights Workshop for Supervisors, which has been held annually since 1959, represents experimentation in this field for community and diocesan supervisors serving Catholic education at both elementary and secondary levels. The uniqueness of the Loretto Heights program was brought home to me while attending a conference on supervision of English at the United States Office of Education a few weeks ago. A prominent public school supervisor stated that he had never before had an opportunity to attend any kind of special institute or in-service workshop planned specifically to meet the needs of supervisors.

(Right about now I feel like the psychiatric patient whose principal complaint was that he was always having to make decisions. Decisions! Decisions! They were never-ending. The psychiatrist inquired about the man's occupation and received the reply: "I'm an apple sorter!" In my present role as a research sorter, I have a fairly good idea of how that apple sorter felt!)

NEW APPROACHES TO OLD AND NEW PROBLEMS

There are so many additional reports on significant research and experimentation that I would like to present. We could spend a long time looking at the very exciting experiment which Sister Mary Theresa Brentano is now conducting—shall we say by "remote control"—with a group of girls in a section of Africa. More than likely you remember Sister Mary Theresa for her pioneering work in the electronic classroom and tape teaching. I shall merely excerpt Sister's summary of her African project. She writes:

We are now doing our first explorations through colored pictures to determine their range of experience, power of perception, sensitivity to beauty, and ability for abstraction. We hope eventually to give them an understanding of our demo-

cratic principles and to share with them some of the lovely training for womanhood inherent in our western culture.

. . . we hope to furnish step-by-step information which will enable the girls to make their own deductions regarding the world in which they find themselves. The carefully detailed sequences of our American curriculum will, of course, have to be simplified to their needs. We will proceed from simple observations and experiments to quite obvious conclusions, working always for enrichment of conceptualization to offset the limitations of their background.

The preparation of their instructional material is one of the most fascinating things you can imagine. From picture to picture we go, seeing that each representation shall bring its load of information and directed study.

Again, through lack of time we can merely whet your curiosity over Sister Mary Theresa Brentano's experimental program.

Typical of experimental in-service programs for Catholic elementary teachers is the televised course in the New Mathematics offered for the teachers of the Archdiocese of Chicago under the sponsorship of the Catholic School Board. At a cost of about \$35,000, thirty telecasts on videotape were prepared for broadcast over the local ETV station. Approximately 3,500 teachers viewed the telecast course conducted by Sister Mary Ferrer, R.S.M., of St. Xavier College, Chicago. About 2,400 took the course for credit, which involved participation in six workshops, a midterm and a final test. Fourteen different colleges cooperated in the program, granting three semester hours of credit. Qualified college and high school personnel, assisted by 128 qualified leaders, directed the sixteen centrally located workshops. A very meaningful sentence was added at the close of this report explaining that the videotapes have been leased to the Superintendent of Schools for the Diocese of Nashville for use in the Tennessee schools.

In this age of jet propulsion let us move now to New England. The UHF television station of the Archdiocese of Boston is the first diocesan-operated television station in the world. Educational programs channeled into the schools include "Parlons Français," the FLES course offered in Boston's parochial schools.

Turning our sights south, we shall move quickly to Louisville where the Junior Great Books Program had its beginning in 1957. From data which the Reverend Thomas Casper incorporated into a doctoral study completed at St. Louis University in December, 1963, we learn that 20,000 participants represent a conservative estimate of those following the program as it was set up originally by Monsignor Pitt. Six thousand *Leader's Guides*, written and published by the Louisville Archdiocesan school office, have been sent out. Father Casper, Louisville's Assistant Superintendent, writes: "The steady flow of inquiries continues. I have yet to encounter a single instance where the program has been dropped when once begun—except in those cases where leader replacements simply could not be obtained."

Like the Louisville Junior Great Books Program, the Peoria Program for Gifted Students has many challenging aspects. This program began in September, 1963, with four classrooms of academically gifted children in the fourth grade. Two of these classes are in the Peoria public schools and two in the Catholic schools. Classes for an additional grade are to be added each year. A Coordinating Committee functions as a service agency. Each cooperating school system retains complete administrative control of its students.

A faculty member of the Bradley University Department of Education is director of the Peoria Program and works closely with the Coordinating Committee and the teachers to provide a curriculum especially suited to meet the needs of gifted children.

The success of the Louisville and Peoria programs depends very much on parental cooperation. In his master's dissertation on "The Preparation of Children for Holy Communion by their Parents," William D. Pflaum has investigated a very special kind of cooperation between parish, home, and school which emphasizes the role of the parent as primary educator of the child. Although this research is based upon responses from only fifty-three parishes having programs in which parents share in the preparation of the child for Holy Communion, Pflaum believes the study is significant in showing that "programs of parental preparation are not makeshift affairs designed to overcome the problems raised by limited time and a shortage of religious teachers." Of the fifty-three pastors who answered the questionnaire, forty believed *a*) that the program had a beneficial effect on the quality of parish life, and *b*) that it made parishioners more conscious of the Christian unity of the family.

Pflaum points out: "A program can succeed only if it is designed to meet the specific needs of each parish, and if it takes into account the varying needs of the families of the parish. The program for a Northern urban parish might have to be very different from that of a rural parish in the West. A diocese which is advanced in forms of liturgical participation may be more fertile ground for a program than a diocese which has gone slowly in adopting changes in worship."

THE UNIVERSITIES AND OUR SCHOOLS: PERTINENT RESEARCH

So far in this discussion of "What's New in Significant Research and Experimentation in Catholic Elementary Education" I have not attempted to give special reports on curriculum studies. To do so, it seems to me, would be naïveté to the nth degree, for there is so much to report and so little time in which to do it. On that account, the second part of this paper merely pinpoints directions in which pertinent research and experimentation seem to be moving as judged by investigations presently under way or completed during the last four or five years. I have made a sampling of studies included in the *Phi Delta Kappan* listing of doctoral dissertations in education, which indicate the broad scope of research being done and the many universities where it is being conducted. The sample includes studies representative of areas of particular concern to us in Catholic elementary education, namely: 1) the pupil; 2) religious and lay teachers; 3) home-school relations; 4) administration; 5) supervision; 6) curriculum; and 7) experimentation. Again, time will not permit me even to read the titles and the names of the researchers; still I would like to jet-propel you across the country just to get a glimpse of the many campuses where this research so important to Catholic elementary education is taking place.

RESEARCH STUDIES

1. "Construction and Evaluation of a Test of Critical Thinking in Ethical Situations To Measure any Perceptible Growth in This Skill Among Children of

- the Upper Elementary Grades Attending Parochial Schools." *Researcher*: Rev. Paul McHugh; *Institution*: Boston University.
2. "School Achievement of Spanish American Children in Santa Fe Archdiocese." *Researcher*: Rev. A. A. Schneider; *Institution*: University of New Mexico.
3. "A Study of the Guidance Needs of Catholic Elementary School Students of the Diocese of Brooklyn in Preparing for and in Adjusting to High School." *Researcher*: Sister M. Patricia McLaughlin, R.U.; *Institution*: St. John's University.
4. "Professional Problems of Sister Teachers in the United States." *Researcher*: Sister Rose Matthew Mangini, I.H.M.; *Institution*: Fordham University.
5. "A Study of the Problems of Beginning Sister-Teachers of Reading with Implications for Preservice Sister-Teacher Education." *Researcher*: Sister Rose Herbert; *Institution*: Columbia University.
6. "The Role of the Lay Teacher in Catholic Education." *Researcher*: Rev. William Myers; *Institution*: University of Notre Dame.
7. "Study of the Lay Teacher in the Catholic Elementary Schools of the Galveston-Houston Diocese with the Development of a Handbook of Policies." *Researcher*: Sister Teresita Partin; *Institution*: Loyola University of Chicago.
8. "The Relation of Religious Affiliation to Parents' Opinions Concerning Child Rearing and Children's Problems, and Parents' Evaluations of Their Own Personalities." *Researcher*: Paul Henry Whiteman; *Institution*: University of Minnesota.
9. "A Study of Parental Opinion Toward Catholic Parochial Schools and Some Influential Factors." *Researcher*: George E. Murray; *Institution*: Boston University.
10. "An Evaluation of the Instruction Phase of the School Health Program in Catholic Parochial Elementary Schools in the Diocese of Lafayette, Indiana." *Researcher*: Richard Scharf; *Institution*: University of Indiana.
11. "A Survey of the Services of the Catholic Guidance Clinic of Cincinnati to School Children." *Researcher*: Sister M. Dominica Barrett; *Institution*: University of Cincinnati.
12. "A Study of the Elementary Schools Conducted by the Sisters of Mercy, Province of Detroit." *Researcher*: Sister Mary Victorine Rapin; *Institution*: Wayne University.
13. "A Study of Professional Laboratory Experiences Provided for Prospective Elementary School Sister-Teachers." *Researcher*: Sister Ann Myra Seaver; *Institution*: University of Oregon.
14. "Modifications in Identity: A Study of the Socialization Process During an Eight-Year Sister Formation Program." *Researcher*: Sister Mary St. George, B.V.M.; *Institution*: University of Chicago.
15. "The Montessori Elementary Curriculum Content and the Corresponding American Curriculum Content: A Cross-Cultural Study." *Researcher*: Joyce Costa-Minneci Di Villareal; *Institution*: American University.
16. "Meaning in the Vocabulary of Religion at the Upper Elementary Level." *Researcher*: Sister M. Annette, O.S.U.; *Institution*: Catholic University.
17. "Geographic Education in the Public and Parochial Schools of a Four-County Sampling of Pennsylvania." *Researcher*: Bruce E. Adams; *Institution*: Pennsylvania State University.

18. "Evaluation of the Outcomes of Teaching Arithmetic in the Catholic Elementary Schools of the United States." *Researcher*: Sister Mary Violette D'Souza; *Institution*: St. Louis University.
19. "A Comparative Study of Reading Achievement at the Fourth-Grade Level Under Two Methods of Instruction: Modified Linguistic and Traditional Basal." *Researcher*: Sister M. Edward, P.B.V.M.; *Institution*: University of Minnesota.
20. "The Current Status of the American Montessori Society and Its Associated Schools." *Researcher*: Sister Mary Fugina; *Institution*: University of Pittsburgh.
21. "A Comparison: Theory and Practice in the Elementary Parish Schools of Contemporary American Lutheranism, Catholicism, and Judaism." *Researcher*: Edward John Keuer; *Institution*: University of Texas.
22. "Provisions for Articulation in Foreign Language Programs in Elementary and Secondary Schools." *Researcher*: Sister Mary Nora Barber, S.S.N.D.; *Institution*: Catholic University.
23. "An Analysis of the Use of Audio-Visual Materials in Catholic Elementary Schools." *Researcher*: Sister Mary Richardine Quirk, B.V.M.; *Institution*: Catholic University.

We have reached twenty or more different campuses. Still, I am distressed knowing how much more is being done which I am unable to report because of its sheer magnitude. Action research in individual classrooms and individual schools; in-service programs sponsored by religious communities and diocesan school systems in almost every area of the curriculum, and I wish to note especially those in the new approaches to the teaching of religion; workshops and institutes offered by colleges and universities to upgrade the preparation of teachers—just to name each of these activities going on across the country would take the time allotted for this entire presentation.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN OUR SCHOOLS: AN ANECDOTAL RECORD

And there is a third part of this paper which I believe should not be omitted. It is the story of a different kind of research from that already reported. As a matter of fact, some may question even calling it research. Yet, in his 1962 book, *Understanding Research*, Van Dalen, a recognized authority in the field, says: "Research is defined by scholars as a careful, critical search for solutions to the problems that plague and puzzle mankind. Research is born of curiosity and nourished by intense yearning to learn the truth and to improve our ways of doing things. Research is a precious possession, for it provides citizens with a key to social progress" (p. 1).

Using this definition, perhaps what follows may honestly be called research. It spans a period of more than thirty years, so we might be permitted to call it a longitudinal study. No attempt has been made to identify, much less to control, the variables. To tell the truth, as the researcher I am the only constant in the study. And since the background and experience of the researcher greatly affect the validity and reliability of any work, I believe you should know that this research has taken me into schools and classrooms staffed by sisters from 115 religious communities and by many lay teachers, in 161 cities in 34 states and the District of Columbia, in 24 archdioceses and 40 dioceses. It has found me in the role of a parochial elementary school teacher, an elementary school principal, a provincial superior responsible for thirty-six

elementary and fourteen high schools, a college teacher sharing in the formation of teachers for public and parochial elementary and secondary schools, and finally, for the past six years in my present role as Associate Secretary of the NCEA Elementary School Department, visiting in Catholic and non-Catholic educational institutions the length and breadth of this land. Knowing the importance of primary sources, I have also tapped the experience and background of Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D., who has been Assistant Secretary of NCEA's Elementary School Department for the past four years. Sister's school visits added to my own show that together we have reached schools staffed by 135 religious communities in 227 cities in 24 archdioceses and 61 dioceses in 38 of the United States and the District of Columbia, and in 8 cities in Canada.

The research which I am reporting here is exclusively in the field of religious education in Catholic parochial elementary schools. It will be presented in the form of an anecdotal record.

Place: Grade 2, Kansas City, Missouri—In October, Janice told her classroom teacher, a sister, that she, too, wanted to be a sister when she grew up because she liked to make sacrifices and she liked to pray. "Whenever I get into any trouble," explained Janice, "Right away I pray to the Holy Ghost. I can't see Him, but I sure can feel Him!"

Place: Grade 2, Spokane, Washington—A little girl, we'll call her Joan, was to have heart surgery. The evening before she told her father, "Daddy, the doctors are going to get a big surprise when they open up my heart because they won't find anything there but Jesus!"

Place: Grade 3, Seattle, Washington—The story of the little heart patient was told to the third graders and they were asked what they thought the little girl meant. Many hands were raised and one child was called on to answer. "I think that the little girl had received Our Lord in Holy Communion so many times that her heart was just full of Love!"

Place: Grade 4, Omaha, Nebraska—Jimmy told his teacher that he was going to Mass and Holy Communion every day during Lent. After a few weeks his mother phoned to tell sister that Jimmy was very ill and had just a short time to live. The Assistant Pastor visited Jimmy to prepare him for death and remarked on coming out of the youngster's bedroom: "If I had the same simple faith in God as my Father and Heaven as my home that Jimmy has, I guess I wouldn't be any more afraid to die than he is."

Place: Grade 4, Rock Island, Illinois—Bobby immediately raised his hand from his place in the back row as the visiting sister entered the classroom and met the new lay teacher. Being recognized, Bobby asked, "Sister, didn't you visit us last year?" Upon receiving an affirmative reply, he continued, "Didn't we make a deal with you that you'd pray for us every day if we prayed for you every day?" After another affirmative answer, Bobby went on, "I want you to know that I never missed saying that prayer once!" And then he added, "Does that deal hold for this year, too?"

Place: A Chicago Hospital—Clement, a fifth grader, was dying of peritonitis. In his delirium he thought the nurse was his mother and cried out, "Mother, if you try to keep me and God wants me, you'll be sorry!"

Place: Grade 5, Chicago, Illinois—Altar boy Adolph was misbehaving during practice for the Forty Hours' Procession and was sent back to his classroom. His pleading won another chance. After the close of the Forty Hours' Devotion, the lad told his teacher that he promised our Lord to go to Holy Communion daily for the rest of his life. He appeared faithfully at the Communion rail each morning until he contracted spinal meningitis just a few weeks later and died.

Place: Grade 6, Chicago, Illinois—The class was writing letters to their Maryknoll missioner in Korea. Marcella closed her letter with this sentence: "If you are ever worried or troubled about anything, just remember that I am always praying for you."

Place: A non-Catholic Hospital in Milwaukee, Wisconsin—Bryan, a teen-ager, was dying. An accident occurred on his first skiing trip. He was in a paroxysm of pain and the word, "Damn," escaped his lips. Scarcely had he said it when he added, "Excuse me, God!" "How do you raise a kid like that?" the intern asked Bryan's mother. This was the story she was willing to tell at the meeting which the pastor called for the parishioners to consider an addition to the parochial school because, she said, the parish school had made the greatest contribution to her Bryan's religious education.

But this anecdotal record must come to a close. I hope it has formed a sort of composite showing that the matter of religious instruction through the years in Catholic elementary schools has been something more than the questions and answers of the Baltimore Catechism and the aim has been more than merely to fix the answers firmly in the children's memories, as Mary Perkins Ryan has stated in her recent book, *Are Parochial Schools the Answer?*

This discussion has brought you as objective a report as it has been possible to give of some ongoing research and experimentation in Catholic elementary education, a report which indicates that our Catholic elementary school educators are striving successfully to meet the challenge held out to them by the late Pope Pius XII when he said: "The Catholic School must, therefore, demonstrate its value, adapt itself for the formation of Christians in the modern world, and defend itself against the attacks upon it in many areas." (*The Pope Speaks*, Vol. V, Summer, 1959, p. 337).

• PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS

Elementary School Department: Officers 1964-65

President: Sister Marie Theresa, S.C., New York City, N.Y.

Vice President: Very Rev. Msgr. James Clyne, Los Angeles, California

Secretary: Miss Madonna Wach, Dayton, Ohio

General Executive Board

Sister Marie Theresa, S.C., New York City, N.Y.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. William E. McManus, Chicago, Illinois

Sister Mary Edward, P.B.V.M., Dubuque, Iowa

Officers 1964-65—Continued

Department Executive Committee

Ex officio members

The President, Vice President, and Secretary

Rt. Rev. Msgr. William E. McManus, Chicago, Illinois

Sister Mary Edward, P.B.V.M., Dubuque, Iowa

Sister Mary Nora, S.S.N.D., Associate Secretary NCEA, Washington, D.C.

Sister St. Regina Marie, C.N.D., Assistant Secretary, NCEA, Washington, D.C.

General Members

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Armand E. Cyr, Portland, Maine

Very Rev. Msgr. J. William Lester, Fort Wayne, Indiana

Rev. J. F. McManus, Charleston, South Carolina

Sister Mary Edward, S.S.J., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Sister Eugene Joseph, S.S.J., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Sister Francis Eileen, S.L., Loretto, Colorado

1961-65

Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas W. Lyons, Washington, D.C.

Sister M. Celine, O.S.B., North Miami, Florida

Sister Sarah, S.C.L., Helena, Montana

Sister M. Virgine, I.H.M., Detroit, Michigan

1962-66

Very Rev. Msgr. John A. Lynch, Burlington, Vermont

Brother Bernard Peter, F.S.C., New York City, N.Y.

Sister Anilla, C.S.S.F., Midwest City, Oklahoma

Sister James Bernard, O.P., Oak Lawn, Illinois

1963-67

Rev. Daniel Brent, Rochester, New York

Rev. Robert Schulzetenberg, St. Cloud, Minnesota

Brother Arthur Philip, F.S.C., New York City, N.Y.

Sister Francis Regis, C.S.J., Milton, Massachusetts

Sister M. Helen, O.P., Los Angeles, California

Sister Jean Clare, O.P., Rockville Centre, New York

Sister Mary Richardine, B.V.M., Washington, D.C.

Sister Romana, O.S.P., New Orleans, Louisiana

Sister Theonella, C.D.P., San Antonio, Texas

1964-68

Catholic Special Education—A National Need

THE MOST REVEREND JOHN J. GRAHAM, D.D.,
*Auxiliary Bishop, Vicar General and Superintendent of
 Special Education, Archdiocese of Philadelphia*

THE TOPIC SUGGESTED for my address to you this afternoon is as provocative in its intent as it is challenging in its implications. For the title "Catholic Education—A National Need" can be interpreted to mean that there are those who need us perhaps more than we need them; that we have something to give that may be of value to those in education who are vexed and perplexed, and more than compensates for what we receive. And yet in the maze of myriad doubts and monumental problems that confront the educational world, the Church, and the Nation today, what can we, the blind, the deaf, the dumb, the crippled, the mentally retarded, contribute toward the solution of questions that demand the best brains and human talents the experts can supply. With the simplicity that befits a department dedicated to teaching the handicapped, Catholic special education offers eternal principles and values from which it draws its inspiration and strength, the faith in which it was born, the hope by which it is sustained and the charity through which it is nourished.

Every child is a child of God. Whatever the physical deformity, each is possessed of an immortal soul, created to the image and likeness of God; each redeemed by the Precious Blood of Jesus Christ on Calvary, each destined to be a Temple of the Holy Ghost on earth and a sharer of the beatific vision in Heaven. To help each soul, no matter how clothed with disfigurement, realize its complete fulfillment and final perfection, Holy Mother Church employs not only means supernatural in themselves, such as the sacraments, but also every good natural means with a supernatural orientation and philosophy. Such a means is Catholic education, whose chief purpose consists, as Pope Pius XI in his encyclical on *Christian Education of Youth* so succinctly states, "essentially in preparing man for what he must be and what he must do here below in order to obtain the sublime end for which he was created."

There are Catholic educators who maintain with erudite but fallacious reasoning that the goal of Catholic schooling is the imparting of knowledge rather than the development of a moral character, that "the ultimate reason . . . for the existence of a Catholic school is not a moral but an intellectual one."¹ Such a philosophy would weaken the incentive to provide for our handicapped, the least of God's children. It is heartening to note that this viewpoint does not reflect the mind of the majority as expressed most recently by the superintendent of schools in the Diocese of Pittsburgh and

¹ Herbert Johnston, *A Philosophy of Education*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), pp. 124-25.

president of the Catholic Educational Association of Pennsylvania, Monsignor McDowell. Discussing in his editorial, "Catholic Education and the National Needs" in the March issue of *The Catholic Educator* (p. 738), he affirms: "Education's first job is to build good men and women and then to develop the specialist. Education seems to be veering away from the sacred charge. This could be disastrous. America and the world needs men who have the ability and the skill to decipher the atom and to understand the universe. We need men who can communicate with others separated by history and culture. But more important, we need men who will use the atom and its secrets with a sense of responsibility towards others. We need men who have proper values and ideals so that their work will be properly directed and used for the good of mankind. Linguists are important, but more important than the ability to speak with others, is the content of such communications." "And," he continues, "Catholic education has always been dedicated to the ideal that the man comes first. If national needs are understood in the proper sense, this approach remains valid. Education must seek the development of the man; it must maintain high priority on values and ideals, it must direct the child toward the Good, the True and the Beautiful." This is the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church as declared unequivocally by Pius XI in his above-mentioned encyclical. "The proper and immediate end of Christian education is the cooperation with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian," and lest there be any doubt as to his meaning, he elaborates: "Hence the true Christian, product of Christian education, is the supernatural man who thinks, judges, and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason, illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ; in other words, to use the current term, the true and finished man of character." It is for this reason that the Church has always concerned herself with the care and education of the handicapped children. For, true, many will never become great scientists, but all can become saints.

Since 1952, a renewed interest has been stirring in the field of Catholic special education throughout the United States. Whereas in the early fifties there were known to be fifteen Catholic schools for the mentally retarded, now there are more than seventy special schools in addition to some seventy-six day classes. A like increase is to be noted in the schools and classes for the acoustically and visually handicapped. Additional programs are being devised and initiated in many dioceses, assuming ingeniously varying forms to meet specific needs, in order that the handicapped child be afforded the blessings of a Catholic education similar in scope to the expansion of facilities for the normal child. For he is no less worthy of our solicitude, as, indeed, his affliction makes him more the object of Our Saviour's love.

Significant in this continuous growth during the past decade has been the establishment in 1954 of the Department of Special Education of the National Catholic Educational Association, coordinating all the previously unrelated activities in this field into one cohesive organized body, bringing the problem into finer focus nationally, attracting better qualified teachers, both from the ranks of the religious and the laity, stimulating enthusiasm where efforts have lagged, and pooling resources and knowledge acquired through experience and research. Not all the children benefited through Special Education are capable of making progress in the basic academic skills, although maximum adequacy is to be sought in the essential subjects. Training in civic responsibility and personal efficiencies directed toward social acceptance and

occupational usefulness is more within the realm of attainment for many. But spiritual and moral growth to the measure of the fullness of Christ in each child committed to our care is the goal we primarily strive for.

God has distributed His talents among the creatures of His predilection according to His unfathomable designs. If, in His loving providence, one talent is withheld or diminished in this child, we find another talent has been given unto him in greater measure. Mentally retarded children, though afflicted in the mind, are correspondingly more abundantly blessed with a largeness of heart and a warmth of affection, and they seem to learn very quickly about the love of God. Indeed, the heart and soul of every Catholic school must be to teach this greater love. Catholic teachers deal with souls, and they are responsible before God for whatever store of spiritual development has been entrusted to them. This is the touchstone of our success; this the ultimate criterion of our achievement.

Since we seek first the supernatural, greater reliance on God's help will have a place in our planning as we provide for our needs. Because teachers of the handicapped child have witnessed a cripple take the first step, have heard a mentally retarded, who never talked before, say the first word, have watched her receive first Holy Communion where but a few years ago this was thought impossible, or even have seen a child smile who never laughed before, such teachers would advise that we leave just a little room for dependence on God's help in seeking the solutions to the crucial problems that face Catholic education today. They have learned to plan and improvise so that a cry for help might not go unheeded. True, they will use all the latest physical, surgical, psychological, social, and other related remedial therapies to further motor coordination and control of spasticity or improve speech defects. Yes, they will avail themselves of every opportunity to advance in sound pedagogical methods through teacher-training courses offered in the field of special education that will enable them to meet any reputable scholastic standard. But having done all that is possible, with childlike trust, they will leave the rest to God, and God usually blesses their feeble efforts with abundant fruits.

St. Augustine simplified our problems when he paraphrased the words of reassurance Our Blessed Lord gave to St. Paul. "My grace is sufficient for thee." St. Augustine said: "To him who does what in him lies, God does not deny grace." There is the golden promise that sustains the faith of the teachers, that stirs the pastor to action, that encourages the bishop to risk bankruptcy. If the Holy Ghost sends us souls, He will help us provide for them.

The grace of God does supply when we do the possible. How much is possible? Faith encourages us to attempt to move mountains. Pusillanimity would have us do less than we are doing. Somewhere in the middle lies prudence. St. Teresa used to say that Teresa and two ducats are nothing, but God and Teresa and two ducats are everything. With the Holy Ghost we have everything, and we cannot fail. Such was the faith of our forefathers, sustained by trust in God and strengthened by heroic sacrifices that made the Catholic school system, as Pope Paul VI has said, the glory of the Catholic Church in America. And such a faith will see us through the doubts and fears of our times to preserve, and indeed still further enhance, what a high government official recently called "the jewel of Catholicism in the United States."

And now I come to the final point of my paper and ask, Why should, or would, a religious community send its better teachers, as it often does, among

the blind, the deaf, the mentally retarded, from whom on the whole, Catholic education and society can expect only a meager return? Well, why did God the Father send His Son among them? Our Lord gave the answer to the practical-minded apostles when they wanted to know why the blind man brought to Him was born in such a condition. It was all so simple for the apostles. Did he sin or did his parents? In analyzing the situation they missed the obvious. The reason was the same, why you, I, and every creature exists—to manifest the glory of God. The glory of God is shown forth in its most luminous splendor when the charity of Christ prevails.

Several years ago, in 1956 to be exact, a metropolitan daily newspaper in one large state, ran a grim series of articles on the mentally retarded. It was captioned "Children Who Walk Alone," which was the title of the first article. Eventually, one of the diocesan day schools was visited, and the seventh article in the series appeared bearing the title "Catholic Schools, A Paradise for Retarded."

The article began: "It was one of those freakish days of early spring when a mere wisp of cloud can veil the sun and rob the earth of all its warmth. It was suddenly cold." And then, a little further down, it continued: "I was inside the building and I was no longer cold. There was a warmth that never can come from gas, oil or coal furnaces." What the author had felt was the charity of Christ. And what this world so desperately needs is a love like unto that. Science can produce food to burn and waste and make the land so arable that farmers are subsidized not to plant the fertile seed, and yet starvation is rampant in various parts of the globe.

What Our Lord came to enkindle upon the face of the earth was the fire of His divine love. And He left us an example by spending most of His public career among those whose disabilities cried out for compassion. It is such a love that has stimulated an ever-increasing flow of dedicated religious and lay teachers qualified in mind and in heart, into the field of Catholic special education, there to reap a rich harvest of satisfying rewards, both of a personal and professional nature; such a love that disposes parents to regard their handicapped child as a singular trust from God, more of a blessing than a cross, more of a family bond than a disruptive force; such a love that animates a class where the strong aid the weak, the sighted the blind, the able-bodied the palsied—such a love that finds its expression in a thousand different ways as help is extended in a community by a thousand different hands; such a love that goes to God through His poor and His afflicted, for these are Christ's blind, Christ's deaf, Christ's crippled, Christ's mentally retarded in His Mystical Body, and one day He will pronounce His eternal benediction upon those who had the faith to see, the hope to encourage, and the charity to act on their behalf. "Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." For, "Amen I say to you, as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me" (Matt. 25, 34-40).

Preventive Mental Hygiene for Children

ROBERT J. MCALLISTER, PH.D., M.D.

*Instructor in Adolescent Psychiatry, School of Social Service,
The Catholic University of America*

THE LENGTHY SHADOW of the home stretches down the years and touches the life of the individual even to his final days. The influences of the earliest years are undoubtedly of great importance in the later development of the individual. These meaningful influences are not limited to the first few years in the home. They extend to the school and the teachers encountered there. They expand beyond the narrow confines of the home and the broader frontiers of school life to the numerous experiences within the community which form the environment for the developing personality.

The behavioral sciences constantly search for more exact knowledge regarding these factors—what they are, how they operate, what their effects are. The final outcome of such research cannot be evaluated before it is complete. But this we know: These scientists work in an area where all the variables can never be controlled. There is always the independent factor of free will. These scientists search for a predictability of human behavior that cannot be attained. Humans are more than machines. They are more complex than the laws which govern them. They are more than a system of impulses and reflexes. Man is more than a stimulus-response organism. The study of human behavior will never reach an equation between environmental influences and resultant behavior.

So many things in life cannot be encapsulated in neat formulas. So many things cannot be regulated by rigid rules or directed by complex legislation. We often wish it could be so. There is often universal agreement that certain goals are worth while, but little specific agreement on how to attain them. This is true in politics, in religion, in community or school organizations; and it is true in the field of mental hygiene.

The work of those who trouble themselves about the troubles of individual behavior is not all in vain. Much has been learned about the importance of early life experiences. Though this seems so obvious today, it was not so obvious a few decades ago. Early experiences were supposed to be meaningless to the growing child not so long ago. It was thought that the child was too young to understand, too little to realize, too undeveloped to be interested. We now know that the infant is not too little to realize it if his mother becomes very tense every time she picks him up. She communicates this to him, and the result may be colic, poor eating habits, or restlessness. We now know that the three-year-old is not too young to understand the friction and fighting that occurs between his parents and may result in his nightmares, difficult toilet training, or hyperactivity. We now know that the five-year-old is not too undeveloped to be interested in body parts and curious about them, so that sleeping in bed with his parents or seeing them nude has special significance for him.

On the other hand, those who labor in the vineyard of mental health have come to appreciate certain factors which are essential to emotional stability. Some of these may seem obvious, but their importance justifies our emphasis upon them.

An appreciation of one's own personal worth comes closest to being the cornerstone of personal mental hygiene. Someone with a firm realization of his own worth cannot be easily shaken by the stresses of his environment or easily frightened by the weaknesses within him. The person who cannot see his own value because of the darkness of failures that descend from without or the mist of fears that rise from within finds himself groping his way through life, stumbling; not because he is weak but because he is blind to the vision of himself; burdened not by the weight of life's problems, but by the acceptance of personal determinism.

A second pillar of strength in personality structure is a sense of responsibility. Few of us are put to the ultimate in terms of life's trials. Under severe stress, even the strongest may collapse. We are sometimes too quick to condemn those who are conquered by the techniques of brainwashing, those who succumb to the pressures of prejudice, those who run in the face of fear, those who, for political power or personal gain, transgress their own consciences. Perhaps we shout loudly over these failures so that we will not hear the voices of weakness whispering within ourselves. We may not run great risks, we may not meet great obstacles; but the constant cares of daily life demand a vital sense of responsibility in everyone. The task is not an easy one.

Discipline might well be included as the third important factor in good mental health. Without discipline, an individual has little control over his inner impulses. The gratification of the moment dominates him, and he loses self-control. A well-disciplined person can meet the problems of life with greater ease than can the undisciplined. There are many situations in life that cannot be changed, many conflicts that cannot be relieved. The disciplined person is more flexible because he can change himself even though his environment is inflexible.

The fourth element in building healthy personality is a certain enthusiasm for a kind of confidence in the value of one's daily living and the ultimate outcome of one's existence. This is the most difficult factor to define, except by its absence. When it is not present, a person has little interest, little joy in what he does, although he continues to do what he ought to do. Enthusiasm is like the salt in soup. If it is present, you are unaware of it. If it is absent, the soup is flat and unpalatable although just as nourishing, just as valuable in the diet. Such is life without enthusiasm.

For discussion this afternoon, we have four factors that are important in a mature personality, namely, a sense of personal worth, responsibility, discipline, and enthusiasm. Parents try to teach their children attitudes about cleanliness. They have various methods and rules devised for doing this. They also teach their children their own value as an individual, even though they may not be aware that they are doing so. Parents and teachers attempt to instruct children in arithmetic and in religion. They must also teach them responsibility. Discipline is a controversial subject in many homes and in many schools. It seems useless to teach children anything about rules, either civic or religious, without instructing them in discipline. Adults are overwhelmed and, unfortunately but understandably, sometimes annoyed by the unceasing questions and incessant explorations that result from childhood curi-

osity. We prefer to teach children what we want them to know, but they want to know everything. We stifle their curiosity and decrease in them their spark of enthusiasm.

This afternoon we shall examine more carefully these four areas of personality development and explore some methods of stimulating their healthy growth. It is impossible, in terms of the complexities of human nature, to establish a complete regimen for child-rearing. There are no shining paths to child perfection or simple formulas for personality development. There are guidelines which are not for the purpose of regulating the children but are for the purpose of directing adult attitudes toward children.

A SENSE OF PERSONAL WORTH

We have proposed the concept of personal worth as the cornerstone of sound mental health. How can one be taught a sense of personal worth? This, after all, involves an attitude about oneself. How do we acquire an attitude about ourselves? Do we develop it from some introspective process, some intellectual self-examination? Or are we born with some stamps of self-approval? No—the child learns an attitude about himself from his parents, his teachers, and other significant adults. From these, the child learns so many things, and he also learns from them attitudes about the facts they teach him. Attitudes about oneself are often the greatest challenge in psychiatric treatment. It is a difficult, lengthy, and costly process to try to alter an adult's negative attitudes about his own worth, attitudes fashioned by demanding parents and un-understanding teachers.

A child learns an attitude of self-respect from his parents if they respect him. A family in which there is mutual respect for one another and for the individual differences and individual preferences of its members teaches a healthy self-respect. Children who are allowed some specific choices from very early years learn something of their own value as individuals. If they have the freedom to get dirty, the choice of eating or not eating their spinach, the opportunity to say "No!"—then they begin to see themselves as individuals and they also see that their parents respect them as individuals. In a home where the rule of parents is strong-armed and hard-fisted, where there is but one choice and that is to follow orders or get punished, the child learns little about his own value as an individual because he has considerable difficulty seeing himself as an individual. If a man loses, or has never had, that basic respect for his individuality, his personal worth, he loses respect for his fellowmen, for his God, for the sacredness of life. This is why I consider this attitude toward self as psychologically more important than one's attitude toward one's fellowman or toward God. One might paraphrase the Scriptures and say, "How can a man respect God, whom he cannot know, or his fellowman, whom he can know only indirectly, if he cannot respect himself?"

There are two ways in which parents deprive their children of a healthy attitude regarding their own personal worth. The first has been mentioned, namely, a demand for rigid adherence to ironclad rules. The second is far more subtle. In this method, the child is controlled by the fear of displeasing his parents who constantly impress him with the debt of gratitude he owes them. In order not to displease them, he must try to live up to their expectations for him. As an infant, he must not disturb their sleep. As a baby, he

must be toilet-trained before any other child his age—so mother can brag about it, of course. Each year, life brings new “musts”: he must be first to tie his shoes, he must be the most intelligent, the most polite, the most washed, the most popular child in the neighborhood. Father comes in with his list of expectations—to excel in sports because father did, or many times because father didn’t, to be popular with the girls, to win a scholarship, to make money.

The tragedy, of course, is that no one ever stops to ask, or even to think about what this child might want. He isn’t an individual. He is a flag that the parents wave to attract the attention of others to themselves; he is a badge they wear and it reads “Parents of Distinction,” he is a pawn of theirs through which they attempt to live out their frustrated dreams, or re-live their faded memories. The child grows into adulthood and his goal remains the same—to please his parents or some substitute parent. He never learns the task of independent decision, the value of independent thought.

The insidious process that belittles the personal worth of children takes many forms. It is sometimes based on the sex of the child. A father of four girls and no boys took no pains to hide his disappointment. His attitude of disdain caused problems for all four daughters. They could not feel worth while if they accepted their own femininity because their father did not consider them of value because of it.

Children in the same family may be compared openly or subtly with one another. One child may be made to feel unworthy because he isn’t as tall as his younger brother; another because he isn’t as good in school as his older sister; another because she doesn’t want to take piano lessons as her older sister did. These are unfair comparisons because they fail to recognize the individuality of the child. A lack of worth is implied because the child falls short of some standard set by the parent.

Let me tell you what happened to two little boys whose parents wouldn’t let them be anything but the best. One is now thirty-two years old and wants only to remain in a mental hospital and be cared for for the rest of his life. From his earliest years, his parents had taken no care to conceal their disappointment in the fact that he was just an average child. He was made to feel inadequate and, so, unloved, inferior, and unwanted. The only real inadequacy was the inadequacy of parental love. The only real inferiority was the inferiority of parental care. In fact, he was just a normal child with no particularly outstanding qualities, or, at least, none which his parents could recognize and nourish. As a child, he could not accept his own limitations, because his parents could not accept him with limitations. As an adult, he could not face the responsibility of living right, because his parents could not allow him the privilege of being wrong. As a patient, he cannot arouse any enthusiasm for the future, because his parents cannot let him forget the emptiness of his past.

It is not that these children fail to achieve valuable goals, but that they fail to achieve the goals their parents set for them. No matter how hard they try, they always fall short. No matter how much they succeed, they fail.

The second little boy whose parents couldn’t allow for limitations or mistakes is now a man, age thirty-eight, and also a mental patient. He describes how he always felt the presence of his parents in his life; and he describes this presence as that of a large, frightening bird hovering above him, ready

to swoop down on him at any moment. He felt that they tried to control his every move, and this feeling was quite accurate. He was a college graduate, a very intelligent man, and had already begun a promising career as an architect. He now sells housewares from door to door. His family no longer knows his whereabouts. He is hiding from the threatening bird of prey.

The application of these principles to the classroom is apparent. The teacher cannot teach each student individually, but she can treat each student as an individual.

Comparisons between students as a method of motivating one does violence to his individuality, to his sense of personal worth. There is nothing quite so unfair as telling a child that his big brother got A's when he was in fourth grade; or his older sister never talked in class; or that his best friend, or even his worst enemy, got 100 in the arithmetic test, so why didn't he? A degree of competition is healthy, but the essence of competition is the recognition that some by nature, by training, or by effort will do better than others. Frank comparisons of this kind are obviously critical, basically unjust, blatantly unkind, and bad psychology.

Competition in the classroom can become a device for creating second-class citizens. It is one of the facts of life, recognizable and acceptable even to first-graders, that some read better than others, that some wiggle more than others, that some talk louder than others. They don't mind that life is this way. They don't quarrel with the reality. Their only difficulty is in coping with teachers and other adults who don't understand it, and can't accept it; and thus, can't accept those who read poorly, wiggle widely, and talk loudly.

Competition that is used to discover the best students and place them on display for the mother superior, members of the school board, the accreditation committee, the pastor, and others, overlooks the second-raters and relegates them to a limbo of left-outs. Those who limp a little, intellectually; those who stumble a bit, pedagogically; those who wobble along, emotionally—all of these need the pastor to pat them on the head, too; the mother superior to smile on them; the accreditation committee to know that they exist.

It is possibly a weakness of our Catholic school system that we feel called upon to prove our abilities, to compete with the state schools, and to outshine them. If such an atmosphere prevails in a school, it places a premium on intelligence and industry. What of the child who is lacking in intelligence? Who makes him feel important? What of the child who is lacking in industry, although possessing ample intelligence? Oh, this is the one we pounce upon with the harping cry, "You are not working up to your ability!" And the implication is, "How dare you not!" I believe in industry. I believe in working up to one's ability. I believe in using one's talents. But, tell me: Have you ever known anyone who did so—completely and unceasingly?

If we do no better than this for the children in our schools, we do no better for them than those parents who treat their offspring as some appendage of themselves; to be used, to be manipulated, to be without autonomy.

If all children in the home were of one perfect mold, parenthood would be an unending joy. If all children in the classroom were of fine intellect, of sterling character, of most pleasant disposition, teaching would be an undiluted pleasure. Parenthood and teaching are a task and, at times, a burden. The reward for a job well done comes not to the parent or to the teacher but to the child who sees himself as a person of worth.

ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY

The second mainstay of mental health is found in the acceptance of responsibility. Here, again, we are confronted with the need for teaching. Responsibility must be taught. It is not some treasured talent which a child obtains at birth. Nor is it something which he grows into, like his big brother's trousers, or which grows into him, like a second set of teeth. Neither is it some happy gift which you can present to him on the day he enters high school or on graduation day. Neither is responsibility like a rain-coat that one can quickly slip into before stepping out into the storm.

Responsibility comes to the child as a result of that slow, painful process known as education. Just as a child must learn to say "Thank you" to grandma, to Aunt Katie, to the "nice man," and to a long line of benefactors, so he must learn by an equally thoughtful and thorough process to be responsible.

How does a child learn to accept responsibility? As with most lessons we learn, the great truths come to us through small understandings. The best way for a child to learn the lesson of obligation is for him to come to understand a specific concrete duty. This is one of the main reasons why children should have some work to do in the home. There are parents who teach their children everything except the lesson of work. They teach their children the social graces for the purpose of getting *ahead*, not for the purpose of getting *along*. They teach their children how to use their minds and their talents in surpassing others, which sometimes comes near to suppressing others. They teach their children to enjoy the good things of life without teaching them how to earn them. The one great lesson goes untaught, and so, unlearned. They fail to impress their children with the fact that the surest way to get ahead is to work; that using one's mind and one's body to improve oneself and to help others is work; that one of the greatest goods to enjoy in life is work.

A child must have the *opportunity* to learn before he can learn. So, he must have the opportunity to learn to work. The lesson should begin early. As he learns to talk, the child is taught politeness. As he learns to walk, he is taught that there are places he must not go. As he learns to do things he should learn to work.

His first tasks, under careful parental guidance, make the child aware of his closeness in the family group. Although Dad may not enjoy having to pick up after four-year-old Jimmy after Jimmy had already picked up the trash in the yard, Dad may renew his pleasant disposition by watching the glow of self-satisfaction on Jimmy's face as he stumbles and falls around the yard "helping Daddy." Although Mother may find it trying to catch up on the rest of her work after taking the time to help Jane help her with the dishes, she can take consolation in the fact that she is performing one of her noblest functions as a mother, that is, instructing her child in responsibility. When Father comes home, Jane's enthusiastic account of her own day's work will renew in her mother the thrill of being a mother.

From his work around home, a child can learn the lesson of responsibility. His first tasks are managed so closely by parents that they take the responsibility for them. If the three-year-old girl breaks a dish, she isn't punished. If the four-year-old boy misses more trash in the yard than he picks up, he isn't criticized. Later on, when age five or six, the child should be held accountable for the performance of small tasks. If the table

is not properly cleared off after lunch, a five-year-old can be sent back to complete the job. If the trash in the yard is not picked up completely, a six-year-old can be sent back to pick up what he missed.

Older children can be held accountable for work over a longer period of time. The seven-year-old can clean up the basement every Saturday. The eight-year-old can dust the house twice a week. The ten-year-old can dry the dishes every evening. The twelve-year-old can care for the lawn during the summer. These chores involve responsibility, not just for the moment, not just for this individual task, but responsibility extended in time. Responsibility for life is an easy step away.

Some parents feel guilty over asking their children to work; and they relieve these guilt feelings by paying their children for everything they do. The lesson these parents impart is: "One has to work, but one should get paid for everything he does." This lesson is not in keeping with reality. Mother doesn't earn a salary for cooking meals, for shopping, for keeping house. Father doesn't get paid for fixing the cabinet door or putting another washer in the sink faucet. Life is filled with tasks that are never paid for with money, but which have greater rewards. To pay children for some jobs gives them an incentive for work in terms of more tangible goods. To keep most jobs without pay gives children an incentive for life in terms of less tangible goals.

Work done for pay alone gives little satisfaction. Modern escapists are those who hate their work so much that they spend all the money they earn trying to get away from it. Children must learn to respect work because it is respectable and not just because of its financial reward. They must learn that there is satisfaction in an unpleasant job that is well done, as well as in a pleasant job that is easily done.

When a five-year-old rakes the grass father has mowed, he is content with a dime for the Good Humor Man. His popsicle is quickly eaten and forgotten. If his father takes him by the hand into the yard and tells him that is a good job and helpful, he is more than content. He is thrilled. In bed that night, he'll continue to feel the satisfaction of having done a job well, even though it took all his strength and left him very tired and very sleepy. He also knows that this feeling is far more satisfying than was the feeling of the shiny dime clutched in his fist or the taste of his popsicle.

As they grow toward maturity, children must accept the realities of life. They must give up the childhood fantasy of having their every need satisfied by doting parents. The infant enjoys such luxurious care and needs it. The six-year-old enjoys it, too; but if he is not going to remain a psychological infant, he must begin to do things for others and not always have others doing everything for him. Children who have work to do in the home are training for real living outside the home.

The reluctant learner, the obstinate student, can often be modified and mollified by giving him some practical responsibility in the classroom or somewhere in the school. For example, being a patrol boy often makes a boy a better student. Keeping students from extracurricular activities because of poor grades only removes them further from the opportunity to become responsible.

One of the prime areas of obligations in a child's life is homework which is like a nine-month plague in many homes. One mother spends three and four hours every evening helping one of her two sons with his homework. The net result of this is a very frustrated mother and a very anxious son,

both of whom are failures. The mother is failing in her responsibility as a mother, and the son is failing in school. Another mother encouraged her teen-age daughter to take Spanish in high school because the mother studied Spanish herself and would, therefore, be in a position to help her daughter. When the daughter took a mathematics course with which her mother was unfamiliar, it was not long before she was failing. The mother quickly hired a tutor.

Fathers, too, can become involved in the problem of homework. One father supervised his son constantly in arithmetic and frequently became angry with his son's slow progress. Although the boy was of good intelligence, he began to doubt his native ability and was soon failing.

Parents may spend many hours trying to force a child to learn some rule of grammar or to understand some problem in arithmetic. As the parent becomes more frantic, the child becomes less flexible. These long hours which are intended to be thought-provoking for the child become thoroughly provoking for the parent. Doing the homework themselves becomes the easy way out for many parents. It is easier than trying to talk their child into doing it. It is simpler than trying to teach their child that he ought to do it. Parents often treat the child's homework as if it is the parent's responsibility. This is the basic fallacy of many parents in approaching the problem. Homework is the child's responsibility. It is a task assigned to him, a task which he should accept as his own. In this way, it becomes not only a lesson which he learns for school but a school in which he learns for life. Parents should not deprive the child of the training involved in accepting this responsibility.

Parents must convince themselves that it is far more important for a child to learn responsibility than it is for him to learn arithmetic. They must accept the premise that homework done to the best of the child's ability is a far greater accomplishment (though perhaps not as correct) than homework done with parental help and under parental coercion.

Schools, of course, must be willing to share this conviction if parents are to be freed from the burden of their children's homework. By the time a child reaches seventh or eighth grade, his homework ought to be an area that involves himself and his teachers. However, schools persist in emphasizing the parental role by insisting that parents sign homework papers and give written information to the school regarding the amount of time their child spends on his homework. This arrangement even exists in high schools. Must we wait until the student goes away to college before giving him the gauntlet of homework? No wonder colleges complain about poor study habits among their students.

To accept responsibility for oneself implies a certain freedom. The concepts of freedom and responsibility are intimately interwoven. But this freedom includes the possibility of mistakes, the inevitability of error. In order to accept the weight of personal responsibility, the individual must accept his own mistakes and limitations. This doesn't come very naturally or very easily to any of us. If children are to accept their mistakes and limitations, their parents and their teachers must first be willing to accept them with mistakes and limitations. This means, of course, that parents must be willing to have imperfect children, and teachers must be willing to have imperfect students. For imperfection is not the result of failure, but the result of fact—the fact of being human.

DISCIPLINE

The third area of mental hygiene is that of discipline. There are two aspects to this. The first involves restrictions, the second, sanctions. Every individual needs restrictions because he cannot fulfill all the desires of his complex nature. These restrictions must be imposed from without, or they must come from within. Again, there is the process of learning. One must learn discipline before applying oneself to it. Left in the wide open fields of permissiveness, the child will spend his youth in unrestricted wandering and his adulthood in the confusion that results from never having found a road on which to travel.

Children cannot be expected to place limits on themselves. These limits must be made by those adults who are responsible for them, particularly parents and teachers. The swaddling clothes of infants make them feel safe and secure. Similarly, the reasonable restrictions which surround a child's behavior, the thoughtful limitations that act as safeguards for his activity, make him feel secure. We are all frightened by the unknown in life, by the uncertainties of time. Events in the lives of adults which produce unpredictable, such as loss of a job, a major illness, a national disaster, the prospect of death, create a feeling of insecurity. It isn't just that discipline is good for a child. He *needs* it to be secure.

Teen-agers may act as if they resent any authority in their lives. They may act this way, but I have never found one who, deep in his adolescent heart, did not realize that he needed guidance. In spite of their natural desire for full freedom, rather because of this desire, because of their awareness of it, and because of their sincere appreciation of the personal anarchy to which it would bring them, they know that they need restrictions. They look for limits in an expanding world that stretches limitless before them. They need "No's" in a world that serenades them with "Yes's." Children have an intuition, a depth of perception all their own. They resent and eventually have contempt for those adults who do not care enough about them to correct them. The amount of our interest is often weighed on the scale of discipline.

Children have a sense of justice which is much purer and much more precise than that of adults. The concept of sanction is understandable and acceptable to children, as long as it is not contaminated by the personal prejudices or private whims of adults. If punishment is unjust, it breeds resentment. If correction becomes coercion, it breeds rebellion. If authority becomes autocracy, it breeds revenge.

A thirteen-year-old girl who had repeatedly been unjustly punished by her parents was brought to me because she refused to go to school. In a moment of candor and confidence, she described her absence from school as "quiet anger." This was her way of avenging herself against the injustice of her parents. It is a common experience for psychiatrists to see children of normal and superior intelligence who cannot seem to pass their school-work. Much of this behavior is "quiet anger."

There are dozens of ways in which children can be punished. There are only a few ways in which they should be punished. Too often, the method of punishment depends on the personality of the adult. It should depend on the personality of the child. Too often, the amount of punishment depends on the wrath of the adult. It should depend on the responsibility of the child. Too often, the value of the punishment depends on the appeasement of the

adult. It should depend on the appreciation of the child. The type of punishment should fit the temperament of the child. To spank one child makes him *better*. To spank another child makes him *bitter*. So the same punishment helps the one and harms the other. To sit quietly in the corner for fifteen minutes makes one child *reasonable*. It makes another child *resentful*. To scold one child makes him *try*. To scold another child makes him *cry*. No adult is wise enough to know, in advance, what punishment is best for a particular child. Any adult can learn.

To be constructive, the password of punishment should be "trust." If a parent or teacher expects a child to do wrong, that parent or teacher will find punishments frequent but fruitless. A child learns to do what is expected of him. If a child is punished because he is a bad child, he will become worse. If a child is punished because he is a good child who can do better, he will do better. To trust a child does not mean to believe he can do no wrong. To trust a child means to believe that he can do well, and that, as he learns through education and experience and occasionally punishment, he can do better. To punish a child when he is wrong is only a part of the process of education. If he deserves punishment when wrong, he deserves praise when right. Punishment keeps the child on the right road, but praise keeps him going forward.

A child needs a reasonable amount of personal attention, both at home and in the classroom. If the only attention he gets from the teacher is to have her screaming at him, it is still better than nothing. But, if the teacher goes out of her way to let the undisciplined child know that she is interested in him, he may find better ways of attracting her attention.

Children who have been taught the lesson of constructive discipline are ready to accept the obligation of self-discipline. It should be passed to them gradually. The guidelines set by adults must be replaced by the rules of reality, the sanctions of society, the concerns of conscience. The task of the educator, be he parent or teacher, is to confront the child with the fact that reality cannot be warped to fit his needs, that he must shape his needs to fit reality, and that his impulses must be controlled within the guidelines of external reality.

ENTHUSIASM SHOULD BE NURTURED

Enthusiasm is the final aspect of mental health that we have chosen to consider today. This, by contrast with the others, arises spontaneously within the child. It manifests itself through the restless activity that brings the child into contact with his environment and the searching curiosity that makes him want to understand that environment. The sucking instinct may cause a child to take his first milk, but curiosity has a lot to do with the papers, the rocks, the cigarette stubs that he puts into his mouth later on. This is the same curiosity shown in school in later years.

This enthusiasm, this curiosity, must not be smothered if it is to endure and bring the infant through the age of curious childhood to the age of inquiring maturity. If this trait is smothered, it is usually the result of "smothers and fathers" (who can also be smothers). Johnny can't enjoy the thrill of roller skates or a roller coaster because he might get hurt. He can't satisfy his curiosity to climb a tree because he might fall, or to use a hammer because he might hurt his finger. Mary can't fulfill her curiosity for sewing because she might cut herself with the scissors, or for baking because she might break a dish. She can't enjoy an overnight stay at a friend's house because she might

get sick or lonesome. I had, as a patient, a girl who couldn't cross the alley in her block until after she was twelve: she is now beset by vague fears and terrible apprehensions which make life nearly unbearable for her.

Much of the frustration that children experience in school is a result of unfulfilled curiosity. Children, by disposition, want to learn. It is the delicate task of teachers to foster their curiosity, to catch the fire of their enthusiasm, to bring the educative process within reach of their outstretched minds.

I have a twelve-year-old boy in treatment at the present time. He is failing sixth grade. He is also reading on an eighth-grade level. At the present time, if his arithmetic involved adding and subtracting the scales on a snake, and his history involved the story of reptiles, and his geography studied countries according to their suitability as habitats for snakes—if this were true—he would pass without a wiggle. He is intelligent; he could be a good student; but, he is failing.

Education has become a process in which the psychological distance between teacher and student has increased to enormous proportions; and the amount of information which must be communicated from the former to the latter has increased by equal strides. It is the teacher who must find his way across that abyss and grasp the student by the hand and lead him with the lamp of learning. However, *it is not the lamp of learning which brings the student to a richer life, it is the fact that you hold him by the hand.*

Children must fit into classrooms. We all know that classrooms cannot be tailored to fit the individual child. Though this be true, it is also true that children cannot be poured into molds without being made rigid and inflexible. Children cannot be held too firmly under the thumb of authority without their emotional growth being stunted. Children cannot be smothered without losing some of the oxygen of psychological life—their enthusiasm.

We have discussed four areas of preventive mental hygiene for children. They learn the lesson of their own worth if we see them as individuals of intrinsic value, and not as puppets which must be what we want them to be. They learn to accept responsibility if we give them responsibilities to accept, and, in addition, accept them when they make mistakes in the process of fulfilling those obligations we give them. They must, through limitations and sanctions, learn the lesson of reality. Without self-discipline, conflict with oneself and with the environment becomes overwhelming. These three concepts—personal worth, responsibility, discipline—bring the individual to a healthy maturity. Through them, he is prepared to meet the demands of adulthood. It is the fourth factor, enthusiasm, which modifies that maturity with the bloom of youthful vigor and makes of life's demands a trumpet call to adventure.

The Educational and Social Needs of the Blind

REV. THOMAS J. CARROLL

Director, Catholic Guild for All the Blind, Boston

ONE WHO SURVEYS the whole field of blindness in this country seldom thinks of "blind persons" or of "the blind" without thinking of older persons, since relatively very few of the total blind group are under age twenty-one. The immediate inclination of the worker for the blind assigned the topic "The Educational and Social Needs of Blind Persons" would be to discuss the situation of adult blind persons in this country. This might, in fact, be helpful to you in reminding you again of the type of world into which the blind child in your classrooms will be going.

Yet, it seems likely that it would be of greater assistance to you, and of more immediate interest, if we restrict the title somewhat to read "The Educational and Social Needs of Young Blind Persons," understanding that our group of young blind persons includes all of those in the school years from kindergarten to the university.

What are these needs? It would be tempting to answer this in terms of means rather than end, and speak technically about the special tools which may be used in an educational structure for the education of blind children. It would be easy to be glib and, considering the ends of education, to say that the blind young person's needs are the same as those of any other young person, depending then on your expertise to apply this to the problem at hand. It would be simple (all too simple) to summarize the needs in a sanctified phrase, such as that the needs of the blind child are "*Ut cognoscant Te*—that they may know Thee, the one True God, and Him Whom Thou has sent, Jesus Christ Thy Son"; or again in the canonized phrase, "to know, love, and serve God in this world and to be happy with Him in the next."

But the phrases have too often the unfortunate connotation that the knowledge, the love, and the service of God are in a vacuum. Now, clearly, most religious teachers, or at least most religious leaders, have come to recognize in fact, and are beginning to recognize in the planning of their educational courses, that our contact of knowledge, love, and service of God is seldom in a vacuum; rather, it is in a specific environment which we carry with us and in which we move. Above all, it is in a social environment peopled first by ourselves and then by all the others influencing our lives even in the remotest way.

But there is a specific problem for blind persons. Many teachers who have come to the point of seeing the social environment as supremely important in the lives of other young people have somehow overlooked this when it comes to blind persons. In their actions, it is made to appear that blind persons meet God in some sort of vacuum. There is little or no recognition of the total person who functions in the environment; and there appears to be some expectation that blind persons will reach God in a special way. I refer to teachers who think that the blind student, *because of his blindness*, has a special vo-

cation to holiness, to teachers who train others for life but train the blind student only for some intellectual or perhaps spiritual existence, to teachers who neglect the physical or social training of blind students.

These statements may seem overdrawn or exaggerated to some. Look, then, at some of the needs of the blind young person: clearly, it will only be "some" since this is not a treatise on education or on the needs of young people. And, admittedly, my incomplete list will contain headings which overlap one another. It may, nevertheless, be of some assistance in reviewing the problem.

Clearly, our effort must be to help the blind young person to find some formation in his youth which will allow him religious fulfillment in his life—spiritual fulfillment and moral fulfillment. We are on the threshold of being able to offer him something here which he could not have received in the years we have known or in some centuries before. Depending on the action of our bishops meeting in Washington this week, we will be able to give him an opportunity of participating intelligently in the liturgy of the Church. As the Vatican Council's Constitution on the Liturgy is implemented in the years ahead, we can hope increasingly for the opportunity to give him a scriptural-based spirituality such as we could not have given him in the past.

As Mrs. Ryan pointed out in her excellent book¹ which I suspect most of its critics have not read, the opportunity is ahead for a truly kerygmatic approach to the teaching of religion. We will not find it all next week, or next year—but it is ahead; and it has particular value for the blind student in this age of the vernacular. With missals a thing of the past, he need not worry about the lack of a Braille missal. If his formation is spiritually based, he will have less worry that his books of spiritual pabulum are limited. With the new insistence on the preaching of the Word of God, and the importance of the word of God, we can at least hope that his lot will be better.

Yet, he has and will have rights which must be satisfied to have available to him some of the works of Catholic authors which meet his mature development at the level his other reading meets that development. This may still be difficult, but it is something which the good teacher must make possible in one or another way.

The blind student needs intellectual fulfillment. Few will deny this, but too many will limit it to academic terms. He needs exploration, an inquisitive mind, an interest in learning, a desire for knowledge. He needs to be encouraged in every way to latch on to all that is new, to all that is unknown, in order that he may find knowledge and ultimate truth.

Sensory fulfillment is necessary to any child—but it is training a thousand times more necessary for the young person who is blind. Without the use of sight through which new knowledge comes, he must be aided to develop every remaining sense and to use it to the fullest. *Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit aliquomodo in sensu*—and unless we enlarge the scope of the remaining senses, the intellect will be stunted for want of information.

I, of course, believe that the one best qualified to develop the senses, to give sensory training, is the "peripatologist." But every good teacher, every imaginative person should be working with the blind young person to assist in the development—to interest him in it and to give him the necessary feed-back, the information which he can not test. All this, in order that he may have sensory fulfillment.

He needs physical fulfillment in many ways—the development of the body,

¹ Mary Perkins Ryan, *Are Parochial Schools the Answer?*

the healthy body for the sound mind. This can not be something left to a course in calisthenics. And the blind young man or the blind young woman must have an opportunity for running and jumping and taking part in competitive activities. There must be a chance for ease and grace in movement. There must be a chance for the status in physical competitive activities which is so important to so many of the young. Physical fulfillment must again involve the inquisitiveness that we spoke of in talking of intellectual fulfillment. There must be the seeking and finding in physical environments, the suiting and fitting of his own physical environment, his own body, to the physical environment of the world in which he lives and moves and breathes. With this must be the development of daring and the opportunity to explore. Inhibition of this through the fear or rigorous mentality of the teacher can be stifling to the body, to the mind, and to the soul.

Vocational fulfillment is a wide term covering many difficult things. There is the vocation during the school life and the mature life. As to the former, there must be an opportunity for the exercise of talents, for the harsh, rough rubbing of personality on personality, for the ups and downs that are part of every growing life. Where there can be no pushing by the teacher, but only a leading, a bringing out of the personality which is within. What I fear most is summarized in one phrase—freshman president and senior class member—the situation where many a student wins on the basis of his blindness, then loses on the basis of his personality.

But vocation as we normally think of it concerns life—the life after school. If we take it in terms of the economic working activity, it is necessary now to face the fact that we are up against an untangible and unknowable.

There is hardly a meeting or convention nowadays without somebody mentioning the magic word "automation," or perhaps "cybernetics." Unfortunately, although we know the meaning of the words, we have only the vaguest and most contradictory ideas as to what the fact of the cybernetic revolution will bring in its course. Most people appear to believe that there will be fewer and fewer unskilled jobs, and an increasing demand for education suited to controlling the machines which control the machines. But there is also reason to believe that entirely new opportunities may be found in new service fields. There is nothing that I can say to help prepare you except to say that all of us have an obligation to keep abreast of the latest findings and to see wherein the future lies. Then we must be looking for the non-stereotyped, non-stultifying occupation for the person who is blind.

At the same time we must keep in mind that perhaps the future will not be at all like the past, and in the new leisure it may well be that job or position status will no longer hold first place. It may be, instead, that leadership and leisure may be the future status vocation. Here again, if this is true, the blind person must find fulfillment.

But vocational fulfillment to many of us has a somewhat more restricted meaning. We still think of vocational with a capital "V" and think of the religious vocation. Here I can only say that somehow the future must find an end to prejudice against blind persons in religious orders and communities. I do not believe for a moment that every blind person has a religious vocation or that most do. But certainly some have this vocation and many have met the rebuffs of prejudice in trying to carry it out. Perhaps as far as the priesthood is concerned there will be no opportunities—at least for testing the degree of prejudice—because after the Council the blind person might well have a greater possibility of carrying out the life of the special priesthood. The greatly in-

creased use of the vernacular, the distribution of roles in the liturgy, with deacons and subdeacons announcing the Word of God, and especially the increased use of concelebration in the Western Church, may well open up opportunities in the priesthood which had been closed many years except to the exceptional few.

Sexual fulfillment is a right of the blind person. And we must keep this in mind at all times in dealing with young persons who are blind. It may be that the sexual fulfillment is that which is found in the giving of one's self to God in a life of celibacy when one is called in this direction—or it may be sexual fulfillment in the life of marriage. But, whatever the road to be taken, the blind young man must be given the opportunity for developing his manhood and the blind young woman her womanhood. With this is a social fulfillment where the complementary natures of the sexes are recognized and given an opportunity for growth. All too often in the past there has been a senseless segregation of the sexes in the education of blind children or a failure to allow for developmental needs. If our own attitude and outlook are balanced and mature with regard to blindness and with regard to sex, then these are problems which we will help to solve rather than to exaggerate by avoidance.

Social fulfillment is a broad term that has to do with all that we have talked about and more. It has to do once again with the give and take. It has to do with independence. It has to do with equality in the widest sense of that word—in the sense which the Supreme Court has helped to teach us. This minority group must, like all minority groups, be given an opportunity for full functioning.

I said that I would give a partial list, and the partial list has grown long. Perhaps it is enough to stimulate and to even cause concern. Perhaps it is enough so that in a period of discussion you may enrich the list and bring out the totality of its meaning.

What are the educational and social needs of young blind persons? They are for a training and an opportunity that they may find life in its fullest here and hereafter—the liberty of the sons of God—and the pursuit of that happiness which can be found in reflection here and in totality in the life to come.

Educational and Social Needs of the Deaf

PETER J. OWSLEY

*Assistant Headmaster, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Associate Professor,
Pennsylvania State University*

MUCH OF THE PUBLIC DEBATE for a decade or more about the need for improved curriculum content in general education has been over the progressive education controversy. The advocates of improvements have often suggested a return to solid subject matter and intellectual discipline through a revival of the basic subjects taught in the late nineteenth century. The problem is not that simple, either in general education or in education of the deaf. The

accelerated growth of knowledge and the increasing complexity of society make it impractical simply to return to the old curriculums. The question of what to teach and when and how to teach have to be reconsidered afresh in the light of the world we live in today and the almost unforeseeable world our deaf children will live in.

It is my opinion that deaf education has not kept pace with the rapid adjustments and changes that have been instituted in general education since Sputnik. If we are to move ahead in our field, it is imperative that we take a long hard look at what is taking place in general education throughout the country.

For too long, educators of the deaf have been concerned with oralism and manualism, feeling that in resolving this problem, all of the educational problems of deaf children will be resolved and a panacea will have been found. Whether a teacher teaches orally or uses the simultaneous method is not the important question. I feel that the problem lies much deeper than this, as I have seen well-educated, successful deaf adults taught by either method. The important thing is that the deaf child's teacher be well-trained and highly competent, whichever method he uses. It is also imperative that all teachers in a given school follow the method, whether it be oralism or manualism, as outlined in the philosophy of the school as it relates to the education of the hearing-handicapped children entrusted to their care. Equally important is the need for a modern, up-to-date, well-developed curriculum. I do not believe it is possible to give our deaf children the type of education they deserve if the curriculum and the instruction throughout the school are not of the highest quality. It is my feeling that the greatest educational need of hearing-handicapped children is a curriculum designed to challenge and develop each child to the limits of his ability. Unless the curriculum in schools for the deaf is modernized, the average educational retardation of deaf children will increase from the present three to five years to more than five years.

I would like to share with you three important ideas presented by Jerome S. Bruner as they concern curriculum. The first concerns itself with the scope of the curriculum, the second with the sequence of curriculum, and the last, the pursuit of excellence.

Jerome S. Bruner, in discussing the scope of curriculum, says:

There has always been a dualism in our educational ideal; a striving for a balance between what Benjamin Franklin referred to as the useful and the ornamental. As he put it in the mid-eighteenth century, it would be well if they could be taught everything that is useful and everything that is ornamental, but art is long and their time is short. It is, therefore, proposed that they learn those things that are likely to be most useful and most ornamental. The concept of the useful in Franklin and in the American educational ideal afterward was two-fold. It involved, on the one hand, skills of a specific kind, and on the other, general understandings to enable one better to deal with the affairs of life. Then it should follow that a curriculum ought to be built around the great issues, principles and values that a society deems worthy of the continual concern of its members.

Franklin's concept of the useful and the ornamental, as expressed by Bruner, has real implications in curriculum development in schools for the deaf. John Dewey in his book *Democracy and Education* addresses the same point when he says, "Every society gets encumbered with what is trivial, with dead wood

from the past and what is positively perverse." It is the responsibility of educators of the deaf to eliminate the trivial and dead wood from their curriculum and include the great issues, principles, and values. In short, take the fire but leave the ashes.

In the writer's opinion, Jerome Bruner summarizes in two sentences the question of what should be the scope of the curriculum when he says:

We might ask as a criterion for any subject taught in primary schools whether when fully developed it is worth an adult's knowing, and whether having known it as a child makes the person a better adult. If the answer to both questions is negative, or ambiguous, then the material is cluttering the curriculum.

The second idea has to do with the sequence of curriculum. Bruner says:

Experience over the past decade points to the fact that our schools may be wasting precious years by postponing the teaching of many important subjects on the grounds that they were too difficult. The foundation of any subject may be taught to anybody at any age in some form. Though the proposition may be startling at first, its interest is to underscore an essential point, often overlooked in the planning of curriculum. It is that the basic ideas that lie at the heart of all science and mathematics, and the basic themes that give form to life and literature are as simple as they are powerful. To be in command of these basic ideas, to use them effectively, requires a continual deepening of one's understanding of them, that come from learning to use them in progressively more complex forms. A curriculum as it develops should revisit these basic ideas repeatedly, building upon them until the student has grasped the full formal apparatus that goes with them.

This concept is especially important in curriculum development in schools for the deaf, as many of our administrators and teachers have postponed the teaching of many concepts on the grounds that they were too difficult and deaf children could not learn them. It is my feeling that the achievement level of deaf children can be raised if concepts are introduced in progressively more complex forms.

Jerome Bruner has an interesting point of view regarding the readiness for learning. He says, "We can begin with the hypothesis that any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development. It is a bold hypothesis and an essential one in thinking about the nature of curriculum." He continues:

The pursuit of excellence must not be limited to the gifted student, but the idea that teaching should be aimed at the average student in order to provide something for everybody is an equally inadequate formula. The question seems to many of us whether to devise materials that will challenge the superior student, while not destroying the confidence and will to learn of those who are less fortunate. We have no illusions about the difficulty of such a course. Yet it is the only one open to us if we are to pursue excellence and, at the same time, honor the diversity of talents we must educate.

With advances in science and technology, and the decline in the number of jobs because of automation, it is imperative that our deaf students be well prepared academically for higher education so that they can compete in a hearing world.

Major improvements in the quality of education can only be accomplished by making basic changes in present practices. The school for the deaf of tomorrow, if it is to be a markedly better school, must differ in many ways from the school for the deaf of today.

During the past two school years, the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf has been actively engaged in curriculum revision and development because we feel that this is a very critical issue in the education of the deaf child. Released time, on a half-time basis, every week was given to one of our curriculum committees, with the rest of the committees meeting after school one day each week. During the course of the year, three of our committees worked on released time, with the result that our curriculums in language, reading, and speech are now completed. Throughout the country, schools for the deaf are actively engaged in curriculum revision and development. This is as it should be. However, I feel that there is a need for curriculum development on a state and national level, so that the best minds in the state and nation may be brought to bear upon this vital issue.

Charles M. Jochem, in a paper before the American Vocational Association in Atlantic City in 1963, pointed out another educational need of deaf children when he said: "Schools for the deaf, with the traditionally small classes, have always professed to be concerned with the specific needs of the individual deaf child. But are we really living up to this premise? Let us refer to the approximate 10 percent of our deaf students who go on to college. The remainder, or approximately 90 percent, essentially will enter the labor market. Yet most of our schools are entirely set up for the 10 per cent minority and are devoting very little to the special needs of the other 90 percent." If the majority of our deaf students are to compete with their hearing peers in industry, it will be necessary for schools for the deaf throughout the country to develop vocational programs that will graduate students with the necessary skills to do so. The early history of the education of the deaf demonstrates that schools for the deaf were pioneers in vocational education. For whatever the reason, we have stood still, while general education has made great progress in vocational education, until today only a few schools for the deaf offer an adequate vocational program.

Mr. Jochem suggests that we explore the possibilities of developing area schools for the higher education of the deaf, including an academic education for those students capable of a four-year college program, and also a vocational and technical program that is both extensive and of high quality. There is no doubt in my mind that the area high school and vocational school is the answer to the educational needs of our older deaf students. This is probably one of the best ways that we can pursue excellence and at the same time honor the diversity of talents we must educate.

Another educational and social need of the deaf student is the acquisition of speech and language, so that he will be better equipped to live and work in society. Helen Keller, in discussing the value of speech and language to the deaf child, said:

If you knew all the joy I feel in being able to speak to you today, I think you would have some idea of the value of speech to the deaf, and you would understand why I want every little deaf child in all this great world to have an opportunity to learn to speak. I know that much has been said and written on this subject, and that there is a wide difference of opinion among teachers of the deaf in regard to oral instruction. It seems very strange to me that there should be this difference

of opinion; I cannot understand how anyone interested in our education can fail to appreciate the satisfaction we feel in being able to express our thoughts in living words. Why, I use speech constantly, and I cannot begin to tell you how much pleasure it gives me to do so. Of course, I know that it is not always easy for strangers to understand me, but it will be by and by; and in the meantime I have the unspeakable happiness of knowing that my family and friends rejoice in my ability to speak. . . . So you see what a blessing speech is to me. It brings me a closer and tenderer relationship with those I love, and makes it possible for me to enjoy the sweet companionship of a great many persons from whom I should be entirely cut off if I could not talk.

One of the greatest educational needs of the hearing-handicapped child is at the present time in the process of being resolved. I am sure that many of you are aware of the critical shortage of trained teachers of the deaf that has existed throughout the country. This situation came about, for the most part, because of World War II and the resulting shortage of teachers, in general education, although I am sure it existed to a lesser extent before the war. Lack of adequate salary schedules to attract teachers; limited teacher-training centers, most of which were located in schools for the deaf rather than in colleges and universities; poor recruitment methods at teacher-training centers; and administrators and boards of education, intent on holding down the budget, were also contributing factors to the teacher shortage. This need for trained teachers to educate deaf children partially has been resolved through the passage of Public Law 87-276 in 1961, which allocated federal funds to colleges and universities to train teachers of the deaf at the undergraduate and graduate levels. I am pleased to say that the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, in cooperation with the Pennsylvania State University, is presently engaged in training teachers of the deaf and our first teacher-training class will graduate in June.

The original law provided scholarships of \$1,600 at the undergraduate level and \$1,200 at the graduate level, plus full tuition.

Public Law 88-164, which was signed by the late President Kennedy in the fall of 1963, will continue the scholarship program to train teachers of the deaf begun in the fall of 1962. This is a beginning, but it is the responsibility of those of us in the field to encourage academically talented young people to enter these training programs and eventually to make a career of teaching hearing-impaired children. As an administrator charged with the responsibility of recruiting teachers of the deaf to fill vacancies on our teaching staff I look forward to the day when all applicants for teaching positions are trained teachers of the deaf and, in addition, a degree of selectivity can be exercised in employment procedures.

Beatrice Hart, in her book *Teaching Reading to Deaf Children* says: "In the education of deaf children, learning to read is one of the most important, as well as one of the most difficult, tasks faced by both pupil and teacher. There probably is not a teacher of the deaf anywhere who does not think that reading can be the salvation of the deaf. There probably is not a teacher of the deaf anywhere who has not experienced deep discouragement in his attempts to lead deaf children to such salvation."

Reading is probably the greatest educational and social need of deaf children, and is certainly the key to progress for them. If they are to make progress in reading, it is important that they have an understanding of lan-

guage and language structure developed through meaningful experiences. The deaf student's work in other school subjects, such as social studies, mathematics, science, et cetera, is dependent upon his ability to take meaning from the printed page. If he has a reading disability, his educational achievement will be seriously hampered. In addition to handicapping the deaf child's overall achievement, a reading disability in the deaf child limits the enjoyment he may receive from recreational reading. In terms of social adjustment, recreational reading is important to both the hearing and the deaf child. Beatrice Hart feels that recreational reading gives the deaf child the opportunity to read whatever he wants, for whatever purpose he has, at his own rate. This is ultimately what we want for the child—that he want to read; that he have the ability and knowledge to choose the books he wants or needs; and that he reads them with full understanding.

I would like to say that I have not, by any means, covered all of the educational and social needs of deaf children. I have discussed with you those educational and social needs that I have been most interested in. I have not gone into such things as the need for good emotional adjustment, the need for developing motorically, the need for developing good social habits, as well as a host of other needs. I do not mean to discount any of these, as I feel they are all important. It is just that the needs I have discussed here have given me the most concern and are, I feel, of greater importance.

Programs for Training Teachers of the Mentally Retarded

CHRIS J. DE PROSPO, ED.D.

Professor of Education, City College, New York City

THE TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation states:

There are no more than 20,000 teachers of the mentally retarded in the nation, and many of these are only partially trained for their difficult and highly specialized teaching tasks. It is estimated that in 1962 only about 500 new teachers will graduate from colleges and universities with adequate teacher-training programs in mental retardation. This number is scarcely sufficient to replace those teachers who will leave the field this year. Seventy-five thousand specially trained teachers are required if we are to adequately educate the 1¼ million school-age retarded.

The abuse and misuse of manpower relating to the mentally retarded and to those with other disabilities is resulting in inadequate services and mediocre programs. It is not enough to provide more scholarships and fellowships and more training centers to train professional personnel to follow patterns established for the past.

Universal education in the U.S.A. received its impetus during the last century. At the beginning of this century, free public education had been established in every state of the United States and free secondary education in most. Between 1870 and 1960 the school population more than tripled. From 80,000 secondary school students in 1870, 1960 had 80 percent of youth between 14 and 17 enrolled. College students rose from 60,000 in 1870 to 3,400,000 in 1960.

Unlike the early secondary schools wherefrom students could leave if they wished, today's compulsory education regulations must provide for all students, regardless of talents and hopes. This concern with general education has great import for us in the field of mental deficiency.

The problem of slow-learning children, characterized as those with IQ's between 75 and 90, is one of the major issues facing public education. In the United States, figures show that although our schools are primarily academically oriented, more than half the children who enter high school leave before graduation. Less than half of the entering college students complete a college course of training.

The reason I have injected this so-called "slow-learning" population into a discussion on the mentally retarded is that I feel many of the children we classify as "educable" or "mildly" retarded could maintain themselves with the slow-learning child if a truly developmental program of education were established. Such a program would be different in content and not a modified or "watered down" curriculum.

There has been much confused thinking on the problem of the slow learner as well as the mentally handicapped. The hue and cry has been for a new gimmick. Well-meaning teachers ask for new methods—new tricks. The *how* of teaching has become the prime concern. But the main problem—the *what*, or the curriculum—does not get the attention it must receive if we are to succeed in preparing children for some eventual life-placement. Methodology, important as it may be, is the last stop on the thorny road in the education of the children we have referred to.

For the mentally retarded we must decide first on the proper identification of the children into dependent, semidependent, and independent categories, based on where they will fit in the social order. Next, we must draw up a valid philosophy of education for each group, and, lastly, prepare a realistic educational program to realize the potential of all children. In 1954, the World Health Organization proposed that we use the term "mental sub-normality" to cover the entire field, with two divisions based on causative factors. "Mental deficiency" would include those cases where there is evident pathology of the nervous system, and "mental retardation" would include the children who seem to be functioning on this level because of cultural, social, economic, or psychological reasons. This latter group makes up the largest proportion of the population classified as mentally retarded.

One brings to any assignment an accumulation of one's own experiences. These experiences are influenced by many factors. One's own philosophy of life, educational training, and professional background have great import. But these factors are also affected by the facility in which one works, the state and its statutes relative to the field, the geography, socioeconomic conditions, and even the governmental philosophy in operation for any particular area.

I did my undergraduate work in special education at Teachers College, Columbia University, during the heyday of progressive education. I was for-

fortunate in having as a teacher Dr. Bagley, whose philosophy of essentialism gave us, in special education, some feeling of security. In retrospect, many of us, probably because we did not understand Dewey, felt that special education was on the defensive. This era produced many studies and articles which set out to prove that children of whatever intellectual level could be taught in the same educational groupings. And yet, if one re-reads some of Dewey's works he will find statements indicating that the school must serve the society in which it exists and that educational programs must adjust their offerings, not to the status quo, but to the needs of the future.

One fact that hit me with terrific impact when I joined the staff at The City College was the realization that special education was but one part of a great educational complex. Up until that time I had worked as a teacher of the retarded, a supervisor, and an administrator. Most of my professional contacts were with people who had dedicated themselves to the education of the mentally retarded. And although I was allowed to retain my own identity, I had to live with such facts as:

1. Of every 16 pupils in the fifth grade, fewer than 6 finish high school.
2. Of every 3 pupils entering the ninth grade, 1 leaves school before graduation.
3. Of the upper third of the high school graduating classes, 200,000 do not enter college.
4. Of the selective service registrants in 1957, 19 percent were disqualified by the armed services test.
5. That in 1958, the shortage of teachers at every level stood at 130,000, or about 10 percent of the entire staff.
6. That in 1959, 27 percent of the qualified teacher candidates would enter other fields.
7. That for 10 years, 7 to 9 percent of the teaching staff served on emergency certificates.

We in special education must realize that our plans for the future must be realistic and relevant to the entire educational program. In thinking about future needs, and with the time available, I have decided to present what I consider to be some major problems.

Just as Dewey stated that the school could not be divorced from the society it exists in, so programs of teacher-training must be aware of practices being followed in the special education programs throughout the state. The problem of *proper identification* and, then, relevant organization of classes, seems to me to be a major concern. In order to come to grips with this, there must be, and soon, a closer working arrangement between diagnostic and instructional agencies. In New York State, identification is solely in the province of the school psychologist. And yet, in spite of the A.A.M.D. Classification Manual and much psychological evidence refuting the use of a unitary measure, we have not proposed a more comprehensive screening program and still operate primarily in the realm of a measured IQ index.

What has this to do with teacher-training? Allow me to define "trainable" and "educable" children as I see them. The *trainable*, or moderately retarded child, is one whose social progress is sheltered living. This living may be in a sheltered workshop, an occupational center, a sheltered job within the community, a residential facility, or the home. The important aspect is the fact that these children will need some type of supervision for their entire lives. It is also important to remember that the presence of

central nervous system pathology is the rule rather than the exception with this group. Because of these physical concomitants, the aspect of adaptive behavioral differences should occupy a major emphasis in the training of such children.

The *educable*, or mildly retarded, do not, as a rule, have gross central nervous system pathology. These are children who, in the main leave school for the world of work, marry, have families, and can make a contribution to society. The prime requisites for this group would be social and emotional stability. When compared with their chronological equals, their special disability would then be academic retardation associated with pathology, not behavioral difficulties.

And, in this connection, what should be the responsibility of special education? Should we use the upper limit of 83 IQ or 70 IQ for special class placement? This has great import for us in teacher-training. If the public schools mandate an 83, our courses at the college will, of necessity, have to make some content revisions. Additionally, should etiology become a basis for classification? We at the colleges will have to get into such areas as problems of learning involving a population with organic defects as differentiated from one with no pathological problems.

As a natural outcome of proper identification and classification come a variety of problems related to teacher competencies. In a survey done for the New York State Division of Handicapped Children (in 1958), it appeared that there was a difference of opinion among school administrators and college personnel as to:

1. Two sets of requirements for educable and trainable.
2. Whether elementary certification should be mandated for special education class teachers.
3. Whether training in special education should be at the graduate level solely.
4. Whether the 12-credit requirement in special education was satisfactory.
5. Whether student teaching was essential and in what areas it should be done.
6. Whether actual teaching experience should be substituted for practice-teaching requirements.

The entire field of teacher certification requirements is undergoing review and change. I feel that it will be necessary for special education to be included in this process. Twelve out of twenty-four contacted felt that there should be different requirements for the teacher of trainable children.

It is interesting to know that New York City at one time did have separate requirements but changed to a single set for both trainable and educable children. I feel that this should be reviewed, and, especially so, if other criteria for placement are mandated.

When one considers that the elementary certification requirements are being questioned for that field, it would seem that we, also, must begin to study course offerings and attempt to answer the question whether or not a program requiring teacher preparation for elementary school work is a necessary requisite for special class teaching. Many programs for the training of teachers are on the graduate level. Was this planned, or did the problem of supply and demand lead to this? I know of no research evaluating which of the two plans is best. If most teacher certificates mandate five-year rather than

four-year programs, then the entire sequence of the general and special field will have to be reviewed.

In considering whether the 12-credit requirement was sufficient, 11 respondents out of 23 felt it was inadequate. However, of these, the suggested additions went from 2 hours to 12 semester hours. Seven recommended a course giving detailed information on out-of-school agencies which would be of assistance to the retarded while in school and on graduation. Six merely listed mental hygiene as an added course requirement.

Other recommendations were for courses in parent relationships, the education of the brain-damaged retarded child, learning, and maturation. Observation and practice-teaching were considered essential by 21 out of 24 respondents. Seventeen stated it should be at both elementary and special class levels.

The question as to whether actual teaching experience might be substituted for the practice-teaching requirement was not raised. This is interesting because our own New York State Division of Teacher Certification is concerned and is holding conferences in the area. For some of us who have had responsibility for the selection and placement of teachers, this becomes a problem of supply and demand. I submit freely that there were times I placed teachers in classes with great trepidation. However, I was faced with the possibility of exempting children from attendance, or the fond hope that through in-service training and general and special supervisory assistance, teachers in this category would become valuable members of the staff. Additionally, this practice is not unique with the special-class program; it is equally true in all other areas of teaching.

The Hot Springs Conference on Teacher Certification made some recommendations that might well be used as guidelines in our estimation of needs in this area. The conference emphasized that regular class teaching experience should not be a requirement. This was not meant to imply that it could not be valuable but, rather, more important was the prospective teacher's interest in broad areas of education and his sensitivity to individual differences in children. The conference also recommended a full two-year liberal arts program; a professional education sequence of 24-27 credits; a special education sequence of 21 credits, and related studies amounting to 12 to 15 credits.

Another area that will require more attention is that of recruitment. It has been suggested that federal funds might be available for providing national recruitment aids for interested individuals in careers to work with the mentally retarded. Guidance counselors in the high schools should have in their files materials such as that put out by N.A.R.C., as "Your Future?", "This Is Not for You If?"

If, as seems to be the case, the entire handicapped population is changing from one with evident physical defects to one with more subtle defects of mental functioning, then the availability of the services of other disciplines becomes important to a program of teacher-training.

The Task Force on Education of the President's Panel discussed the importance of establishing regional instructional materials centers. The materials were to be distributed free on an indexed basis to public and private organizations. I am certain that, if funds were available and the State Education Department, teacher-training institutions, and the public schools cooper-

ated, there would be an excellent reservoir of materials that could be examined and collated for use in the classrooms of our country.

The matter of grant money and the apparent hesitancy of federal agencies to allocate funds for such mundane matters as curricular materials is a pressing problem that administrators and college personnel might give some thought to. This would apply to other areas involved in curricular activity such as day-care centers, private facilities, rehabilitation services, et cetera.

There are many other areas that could be examined with profit such as: team teaching; the "master teacher" concept for trainable; programmed instruction; national reciprocal teacher certification.

One of the most important aspects of the topic we are discussing this morning is the competencies of the faculties of the teacher-training institutions. Approved sequences should mandate, as a minimum requirement, one full-time properly trained person administering the program. If part-time personnel is used, then coordination becomes of paramount importance. Advisement of students is a critical area and includes selective admission and recruitment, course selection, personal and professional guidance, and placement on completion of the program.

Admittedly difficult, the problem of close liaison with the state department of education, the school administrator, the teachers and, most important, "keeping one's hand in" with the children, needs reemphasizing. College personnel should be available as consultants to school systems and other facilities servicing the handicapped. In fact, this relationship should be "courted."

Finally—and by no means do I infer that I have exhausted the topic—we must try to give to prospective teachers the following:

1. An understanding of mental retardation. What militates against the retarded acquiring what they need, if subjected to the so-called "normal school curriculum." In other words, why special classes?
2. An understanding of the world the retarded will live in, a world few college graduates have any contact with.
3. An understanding of the competencies required to live in such a world—the other required learnings as well as the necessary "academics."
4. Training in how to teach these things effectively.

I have seen publications as far back as 1897 and as recent as 1962 stating that the mentally handicapped need a warm, sympathetic, friendly person as a teacher. No one would quarrel with this, but to say that these attributes meet the entire need would lead us once again into the "happiness" phase of school instruction. Only well-trained teachers will be able to prepare the retarded for social and occupational competency at whatever level they are capable of.

• *PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS*

Special Education Department: Officers 1964-65

President: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Daniel Kirwin, Wheeling, West Virginia

Vice President: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Sylvester J. Holbel, Buffalo, New York

Secretary: Sister Serena, New York, New York

General Executive Board

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix Newton Pitt, Louisville, Kentucky

Rt. Rev. Msgr. James E. Hoflich, St. Louis, Missouri

Department Executive Committee

Ex officio Members

The President, Vice President, and Secretary

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix Newton Pitt, Louisville, Kentucky

Rt. Rev. Msgr. James E. Hoflich, St. Louis, Missouri

Very Rev. Msgr. Elmer H. Behrmann, St. Louis, Missouri, Associate Secretary

General Members

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Henry C. Bezou, New Orleans, Louisiana

Sister Joseph Mary, S.N.D., Washington, D.C.

Very Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. O'Brien, Kansas City, Missouri

Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. Voight, Yonkers, New York

Rev. Francis R. LoBianco, Newark, New Jersey

Sister Celine, Greensburg, Pennsylvania

Sister Ann Columba, Brooklyn, New York

Sister Mary Esther, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The Vocation Apostolate—An Integrated Effort

THE MOST REVEREND CELESTINE J. DAMIANO, D.D.

Archbishop-Bishop of Camden, New Jersey

DURING THE PAST TWO DECADES or so there has been a conscious effort on the part of all concerned to increase the quality and the number of candidates who are desirous to dedicate their lives in a special manner to God. A great many dioceses, regardless of where situated, even in so-called non-mission countries, and many religious societies urgently and, in some cases, desperately are faced with the problem to increase their personnel. To solve this somewhat common and vital problem they have made special studies concerning vocations and have utilized the latest techniques in promotion, advertisements, and public relations. One gets the impression that they are rationalizing their problem rather than spiritualizing it. The hard fact is that there is no vocation gimmick. Let us listen to St. Luke (10, 2): "The harvest, He told them, is plentiful enough but the laborers are few. You must ask the Lord to whom the harvest belongs to send laborers out for the harvesting." Also, St. Paul, speaking of the purpose for which any high priest is chosen among his fellowmen, has this to say: "His vocation comes from God, as Aaron's did. Nobody can take on himself such a privilege as this."

It is quite obvious, then, that a vocation comes from God and is an answer to a prayer. There is, no doubt, a special Providence of God for vocations. In this age of television, acute public relations, and the unsurpassed power of the printed word, there is a tendency to glamourize everything in order to make an appeal. Promoting vocations in such a manner can only do harm because life is so different from this approach and the approach itself is dishonest and unfair. Difficulties present a challenge; misrepresentation engenders only discontent. The missionary consciousness on the part of the Americans today is a striking example of their generosity and of their acceptance of a challenge—and this is on the increase. A vocation is a very serious matter for the individual who possesses it and for the community where he performs his service. He must possess the necessary physical and spiritual qualities to follow his calling and not just be carried by it. Today, no one so chosen can hide behind the collar of the habit.

Because a vocation is such a delicate matter, it would appear, generally speaking, that the one who has a vocation would most likely be the first one to discover it in others. This would make every priest, sister, and brother a vocation promoter or director. A priest is generally called "Father" in practically all the languages because by the ministry of the Word and Sacraments he dispenses spiritual life to others. The name of Father would have its full meaning if the priest would, in a spiritual sense, beget another priest. I am afraid that many are guilty of spiritual birth control. There is



no doubt that in matters concerning vocation, generally speaking, those who possess a special calling are the ones who can attract, spot, and encourage a vocation. If there is a scarcity of vocations, let us be honest and accept some of the blame. "You must pray the Lord to send laborers."

The second group who can prepare the soil for a vocation to take root are the parents and the family. This is brought out clearly by the number of relatives among priests, brothers, and sisters. Also, in the Oriental Rite, where priests are married, generally a son follows in the footsteps of the father. One can hardly exaggerate the influence of the home in the matter concerning vocations. The first chapel a vocation encounters is the home where the child plays the part of a priest or a nun. There seems to be a direct proportion between morally broken-down homes and scarcity of vocations. The opposite is also true—morally strong homes and vocations. This is brought out in countries where there are strong Christian homes. Just as parents cooperate with God to bring a creature into the world, they, too, can cooperate with God to foster and strengthen a vocation. The home is the breeding ground for vocations.

The third group that can nurture a vocation is the parochial school and, in particular, the grammar school. As you are quite aware, a vocation is a very delicate matter and the tender age of those in grammar schools is most sensitive to the promptings of the Holy Spirit. Education, in general, and in our case, in the parochial school, is undergoing a big crisis. But I believe that much could be done if our schools could inspire more and more children to dedicate their lives to God. An interesting point to make here is that although there are more Catholic children in public schools still more vocations come from the parochial schools. Another point to make is that the school is a point of contact between the children, the priests, and the teachers. They not only discuss the child's progress, they also discuss the child's character and future.

Finally, the last group to be interested are the people themselves—in society, in the community. As St. Paul said about the high priest, ". . . taken from among men and made a representative of men in their dealings with God." Today, we hear so much of the part that the laity will play in the Church. Even the liturgical life of the Church will be so regulated that all those who are practicing Catholics will have to participate fully and actively in all functions. This, of course, is nothing new. St. Peter called the laity "the just Christians, a chosen race, a royal priesthood—consecrated people to sing the praises of the Lord." Pope Paul VI on the Feast of St. Joseph charged thousands of employees with the task of defending and caring for the interests of Christ in contemporary society. He suggested that they, the workers, might be surprised to have him delegate to them a function which appears to be entirely his own. This world still so restless, so troubled, so needy, must be regenerated. Christ needs today as he needed in His Gospel childhood to be cared for, to be protected, fed, and sponsored within the working world by the very men who comprise it. What better way than for the whole community to pray for vocations, to join groups to foster vocations and to provide the Church with the means to establish seminaries and schools? The Catholic people of the United States have an enviable record for their kindness and generosity toward priests, brothers, and sisters.

In conclusion: There is, indeed, a special Providence of God that takes

care of vocations because no one can take that honor unless called by God. He in His own way will dispose things in such a manner that the person He has chosen will do His work. As God used His human nature to redeem humanity, likewise He uses us humans in different roles to continue His priesthood on earth.

The Morality of Psychological Testing of Vocation Prospects

REV. ROBERT HOWARD SWEENEY, C.S.C.

Professor of Pastoral Psychology, Holy Cross Fathers,

Mission of San Jose, California, and Notre Dame, Indiana

THIS QUESTION OF THE MORALITY of psychological testing has not been discussed extensively. Pope Pius XII broached it summarily in 1958, stating that "it is immoral to penetrate into the conscience of anyone, but this act becomes moral if the interested party gives his valid consent."¹

The psychologists who encourage testing of candidates have rather assumed that there is no great ethical problem; a few articles have appeared to justify the testing programs, and the movement for testing seems to be gaining ground. At the same time, there is a growing opposition among some of the seminary staffs and faculty members in houses of formation; these conservatives believe there is need for more careful selection of candidates, but they are not overly impressed with the ability of most clinical psychologists and psychiatrists to evaluate the suitability of a candidate for priesthood or religious life. The conservatives are concerned over the infringement of privacy and lack of freedom in the assessment programs; most of the opposition is vigorously expressed in common rooms, but does not appear in print.²

The question of the morality of screening tests is somewhat more complex than would appear at first blush, in my opinion. The art of personality testing is developing but is a long way from an exact science. The views expressed here have been largely shaped by experience with a testing program conducted over the past eleven years by the midwestern provinces of the Congregation of Holy Cross, compared with the reports of other testing programs for vocation prospects. Perspective and very concrete knowledge has been added by some years as spiritual director in houses of study at the college level and the theology level, and by four years of teaching pastoral psychology in the pastoral training year for newly ordained priests.

During the eleven-year period between 1953 and 1964, more than 1,000 candidates for the priesthood and brotherhood were tested before entrance into the novitiates. The core battery includes the Ohio State Pathological Inventory, which is a college academic placement test; the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, commonly called MMPI, which is diagnostic

of personality adjustment in certain areas; and the Kuder Preference Record, which delineates area of interest among various kinds of occupations. Individual follow-up tests have been administered in cases where there seemed to be a need, and therapeutic counseling or psychiatric referral has been given in a limited number of cases.

A rather clear picture of the successful and the non-persevering candidates has emerged. Some of the results were quite unexpected. A thorough comparison between seminary candidates who have persevered to priesthood or perpetual profession and those who have dropped out of training has been completed.³

In reference to the morality of psychological testing of candidates for priesthood and religious life, I should like to propose the following conclusions:

1. Intelligence testing involves no violation of personal rights of candidates; for example, the Ohio State University Psychological Inventory; the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale.
2. Vocational preference and aptitude testing involves no violation of personal rights; for example, the Kuder Preference Record; the Strong Vocational Interest Blank.
3. Personality and character assessment testing, if optional and freely taken by the candidate, involves no invasion of personal rights, but must be kept as confidential information; for example, the MMPI, Thematic Apperception Test; California Personality Inventory; Rorschach; Sixteen Personality Factor Test.
4. Personality and character assessment testing, if involuntary and a compulsory condition for entrance into the institution, does not involve violation of personal rights of the candidate, *provided*:
 - a) It is used to diagnose emotional adjustment for the benefit of the individual candidate;
 - b) It is not used as a screening-out device determining admission or rejection of candidates;
 - c) The record is retained by a qualified psychologist, who makes an over-all report of the test battery for the superiors;
 - d) The record is not handed over to the staff who decide the fate of the candidate; nor is it kept in the candidate's personal file accessible to staff.

Comment: This means that the personality testing is used clinically for the purpose of diagnosis and possible counseling help. It is not used as a screening instrument or predictive instrument. The test results will be used by a qualified psychologist, preferably a member of the seminary or institute, to draw up a summative report as an aid to the staff who decide admission and promotion of candidates; the record will not be included in the personal file of the candidate where it could be observed by faculty who might be suspicious or critical of the candidate. With the permission of the candidate, the record can be made available to the candidate's spiritual director, provided the director has enough training to interpret the record properly.

5. Involuntary subjection to personality and character assessment testing directly used as a screening-out device is not morally justified. But the seminary or religious institute is within its rights in making the assess-

ment testing a condition for acceptance, provided the results be kept confidential and be interpreted by a competent psychologist, chiefly for the purpose of guidance and help to the candidate in the strengthening of his vocation.

Comment: The candidate is entitled to be accepted or rejected on the basis of personal appraisal by the staff, not on the basis of a test profile. The tests do not measure vocation, they measure emotional adjustment; they must be interpreted with extreme caution and used as auxiliary information to supplement the observation and appraisal of the staff.

Personality tests, such as MMPI, TAT, Sentence Completion, are subject to the influence of many variables such as test-taking attitude, mood of subject, surrounding conditions, personality of the test-giver. They are as changeable as the subject and the tester.

This is particularly true where the candidate believes that the tests will be employed as screening instruments; he is very liable to role-play a "good candidate," with substantial effects on the results of any self-descriptive test, and with loss of honest spontaneity in the projective tests such as Sentence Completion, TAT.

It has been clearly demonstrated that in spite of the "validating scales," faking good cannot be detected on the MMPI.⁴ This is equally true of other personality tests.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN THE USE OF TESTING PROCEDURES

Poor emotional adjustment in a priest or religious can be particularly scandalous and damaging: it may destroy the capacity to carry on an effective apostolate. Consequently, we can assume that the institution has the right to use whatever effective means are available to screen out pre-psychotics, the neurotics who will become community liabilities, and the defective personalities who are lacking the capacity to adjust suitably. But we still must face the problem of whether it is ethical to subject a candidate to a battery of tests that probe into his basic impulses, his impulse-controls, his secret actions which might be psychologically questionable and which may verge on moral imputability. For example, if the psychological test includes questions which would reveal above-average homosexual attraction, and if the candidate has a history of some homosexual reactions that have been confessed as they appear before God, is the institution justified in broaching this area of psychological-moral stability? This is a delicate problem, troublesome to moral theologians.

TRADITIONAL SELECTION BY INTERVIEW HAS NOT PROVED ADEQUATE

In 1956 the Holy See urged that there be more careful assessment of the mental health of candidates for priesthood.⁵ Since World War II, personality tests and interest inventories have become common in seminaries and religious institutes. These have met with considerable resistance from some of the older generation, partly because psychological tests cannot measure the supernatural element in a vocation, partly because there is no substitute for personal observation by the faculty, and partly because "the psychologists need testing more than anybody"—at least as seen by some senior citizens in religious life.

The unfortunate fact remains, however, that the traditional method of initial interview, faculty observation and rating, and spiritual direction have not succeeded in screening out candidates who are proving to be emotionally unsuited for the life of priesthood or active religious.

CAN PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS DETECT THE MISFIT?

Psychological testing seems to have been reasonably successful in screening military officer-candidates, aspirants for professional and trade careers, and teacher trainees. But is it able to evaluate a candidate for priesthood or religious?

There are two basic principles that bear remembering. First, the value of the testing is in the interpretation of the test results. Seminarians and religious aspirants score somewhat differently in standardized tests than the general population, as would naturally be expected. Consequently, the results cannot be evaluated competently by every seminary professor or novice mistress who has been exposed to a general course in tests and measurements.

The evaluating of test profiles should be done by a person trained at least to the level of the master's degree, preferably a member of the institute. If the institute is lacking such trained personnel, a lay psychologist can do the job adequately. It is far more important to have a trained expert than to have a member of the institute.⁶

Secondly, no one claims that psychological testing is an infallible guide. It is an auxiliary guide to staff members who must judge the suitability of candidates, using their personal observation and their experience as their basic criteria. No one has yet developed a test which will satisfactorily evaluate supernatural motivation; no test diagnoses the amount of God's grace that is in store for a candidate; but even a slight exposure to the personal problems of seminary candidates compels recognition of the indispensable importance of supernatural help. The testing can only attempt to get at the psychological, or natural, suitability of the candidate; this is the less important of the two levels of qualification.

The endowment of supernatural aptitude is more subtle and more decisive than natural aptitude; a person who is naturally well endowed for service of the Church may not have the inspiration for this type of life. This is strikingly emphasized by the fact that the eleven-year testing program at Notre Dame showed that exactly half of the candidates who dropped out of training did not reveal any emotional problems at all. They were evidently well-adjusted young men who found out that they would not be happy in the career of religious priesthood; some of them have become diocesan priests, most of them have gone into social service careers as laymen.

The art of personality testing is developing, but at the present time there is disagreement as to what constitutes the best test battery. Most assessment programs use a form of questionnaire and self-description such as the MMPI, along with a vocational interest test and some form of intelligence test. Dr. Frank Kobler of Loyola University, of Chicago, a highly experienced and respected authority in the field, declares that the MMPI has proved the most useful instrument.⁷

There are some who feel that the pencil-and-paper tests, such as MMPI, are too quantitative; that the real personality problems are lodged chiefly in the unconscious and are fixed in insecurity over personal worth, sexual adequacy, interpersonal relationships, mother-fixation, obsessive-compulsive

needs (which may show in scrupulosity), depression, hostility and suspiciousness, affective disorders. Consequently, only the projective tests such as the Rorschach and the TAT are adequate to uncover the real problems.⁸

By way of objective critique, however, we may discreetly recall that a standard text on the use of the TAT gives more than a dozen different interpretations of the instrument.⁹ The basic differences between the Beck system and the Klopfer system of interpreting the Rorschach is known to anyone who has ever sat through a staff meeting in a psychiatric ward. Projective tests are human instruments and are susceptible of subjective interpretation by the psychologist; they are no better than the man who uses them. Many psychiatrists today place only very cautious reliance on them because they are subject to so many uncontrolled variables.

It is generally admitted that we need to develop more reliable test norms delineating the distinctive personality profiles of seminarians and religious candidates as contrasted with lay students and other subjects; this is one of the reasons why the testing program requires an experienced practitioner who does not suspect abnormality in every profile that deviates from the "normal" standards of lay people on whom the tests have been standardized.

There is general agreement among psychologists that the acceptance or rejection of candidates should be made by staff decisions, not based on a test battery alone. The psychological testing should serve as additional information supplementing observation and personal contact with the candidate.⁹ It is true that the test battery may indicate the peremptory need of psychiatric examination or therapeutic counseling; on the recommendation of the psychologist the institute is justified in requiring further testing or referral as a requisite for admission. In fact, a definitely disturbed emotional state may not require an elaborate psychological test; it is visible to the naked eye of superiors and fellow candidates if they are at all analytical of normal behavior.

THE RIGHT TO PSYCHIC PRIVACY

In an allocution on applied psychology, Pope Pius XII asserted that the individual has a right to privacy about his interior psychic life; the inmost contents of the psyche belong exclusively to the person and remain known to him alone; the person reveals something of this by his behavior, and a psychologist is free to deal with such material, as also with material that the client has released from secrecy; but some inner activity is communicated only to a few confidantes; it is illicit to enter into a man's inner domain against his will, no matter what techniques or methods are used.¹⁰

This is a statement of the general principle of right to privacy. The Holy Father goes on to pinpoint the concrete area that is protected. He states later in the instruction¹¹ that "it is immoral to penetrate into the conscience of anyone; but this act becomes moral if the interested party gives his valid consent."

It is significant that he uses the term "conscience." This indicates the arc of moral right and wrong, formal sin or virtuous act. Conscience is the judgment of moral right or wrong; it is not the area of mere psychological impulse or emotional drive. It is the precise area of conscience that is protected by the right of privacy, because moral guilt is a matter between the person and God alone. Sometimes for the common good a person is obliged

to reveal his inner secrets; but in that case the revealed matter remains strictly confidential.

The concrete designation of conscience by the Holy Father suggests some observations concerning the inner activities that are revealed by psychological tests, and the area covered by right of privacy.

1. It is no secret that everyone has the same basic impulses, for example, anger, fear, sexual desires, jealousy. This fact is not protected by a right of secrecy, whether it is revealed by psychological tests or not.

2. It is no secret that everyone has a problem at times in trying to control and channel his basic impulses. If he never has a problem, a man is a psychopath or psychotic. (We assume that he is not confirmed in grace.) Even canonizable saints have problems of controlling their impulses; a pattern of controlling impulses is virtue, or habitual adjustment.

3. The degree to which a particular pattern of impulses is troublesome to an individual person is his own private business; but this is manifested to a very considerable degree by his habitual behavior. It is far from a complete secret, and he has no absolute right to privacy. For example, if I feel a deep-seated resentment toward my local superior, or against one of my senior confreres, the struggle that I must go through to control this powerful passion does not go unnoticed by the people who live with me. If a psychological test reveals that I have a strong hostility toward my father, and consequently I am troubled by all authority-figures, it may come as news to me but it is generally well known to any of my associates who are normally observant. This is not really a secret, and I have no total right to confidentiality in regard to test results that are fairly common knowledge.

4. The actual *failure* to control impulses adequately is a matter of psychological adjustment. It is also the *material* element of sin, or moral lapse. But the *formal* element is something further, namely, awareness of the moral implications of the impulse and a deliberate choice of an action. Actual *success* in controlling impulses is the material element of the act of virtue; the formal element is the awareness and deliberate choice of the controlled behavior.

The person has a strict right to privacy about this *formal element* of moral failure or success, that is, evil choice or virtuous choice, because this fact is known only to himself, to God, and to those in whom he confides. A psychological test does not reveal the formal element of success or failure; it reveals only the presence of certain patterns of impulse, and something of the strength of these impulses. The tests do not indicate the strength of the values that constitute motivational strength in the candidate and assist him in controlling his basic impulses. The Rorschach interpretation purports to give indication of the degree of ego-strength but it is a rather vague area. Some interpretations of the TAT also attempt to bring out motivational influences, but there is pronounced disagreement among psychologists as to the reliability of these constructs.

Let us take the case of a religious candidate who is victimized by uncontrolled bursts of temper or fear. He may not be formally guilty of any moral evil whatever. The clinical psychologist is not concerned with his *moral* status, he assiduously avoids any moralizing judgments, he is concerned with the psychic control of impulses which strive to govern behavior. The ability to

control instinctive impulses is the measure of personal adjustment, the measure of virtue.

Clinical psychologists of mechanistic leanings may tend to assume that a candidate with defective heterosexual orientation will actually indulge in homosexual behavior in a lesser or greater degree; but they eschew moral judgments, and they keep as open a mind as possible on the facts of actual control of the homosexual attraction.

It would be Jansenistic on the part of a superior to assume that a subject whose tests reveal paranoid impulses is automatically an overt critic of the administration, or that a latent homosexual attraction necessarily involves overt over-familiarity. It is not only the psychologists who are conditioned by pre-conceptions.

From all of this, I should like to suggest the conclusion that psychological tests do not reveal nearly so much secret material as is suspected by some opponents of testing programs.

FREE CONSENT TO THE USE OF TESTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES

The objection is sometimes voiced that before a religious subject or seminarian can give free consent to administrative use of psychological tests, he must have a clear idea that the test will reveal material that may be unknown to him, embarrassing to him, hidden traits of character.¹²

This objection appears to give the tests credit for doing more than they actually can. Self-descriptive tests, like the MMPI, reveal only what the candidate chooses to state. Projective tests, like the Rorschach, were designed to reveal unconscious impulses; but actually the unconscious currents can only be inferred by the psychologist from what is reported as seen by the test-taker and what emotionally sick patients tend to see in the ink blots. The interpretation is colored by the psychologist's personal experience with the test instrument. A wise diagnostician will not make a definitive interpretation based on a single test; he calls upon a psychiatric case history, a personal interview, and a battery of confirmatory tests. Even so, the classic projective test, the Rorschach, has come under increasing suspicion from many psychiatrists because it is subject to the influence of so many uncontrolled variables, reflects so much of the personality of the psychologist and so little that is definitive about the personality of the patient.

Moreover, the fear that the tests will reveal specific, clear-cut character traits is unwarrantedly flattering to the tests. They are not that good, in the judgment of experienced practitioners. We are left with the conclusion that psychological tests should not be employed for purposes beyond their capacities. They are designed to diagnose emotional disturbance. They are not designed to ascertain emotional suitability of candidates for priesthood or religious life. A few special tests have been designed for this specific purpose. They are being employed on an experimental basis at some testing centers, but only years of validation studies will prove what value they have.¹³

A REPORT ON THE NOTRE DAME TESTING PROGRAM

A report has been drawn up describing the findings of the ten-year testing program at Notre Dame, Indiana, from 1953 to 1963; more than a thousand candidates have been tested; the battery of tests included the Ohio State

University intelligence placement test, the MMPI, and the Kuder. Some rather interesting results have emerged.

I should like to describe here some salient results among a group of 461 seminarians, candidates for the religious priesthood, of whom 335 have dropped out, and 126 have been definitively successful, having persevered to priesthood or perpetual religious profession. The apparent discrepancy in numbers arises from my intent to contrast definitely successful candidates with those who dropped out of training; consequently, the large number of seminarians who are presently in temporary vows have not been included since some of them may discontinue. After perpetual profession the number of dropouts has been negligible.

We are particularly interested in the contrast between the MMPI records of the two groups. Here are some of the interesting findings:

1. The persevering group produced lower scores in every clinical area of the MMPI; that is, their average was closer to the average score of the lay people whose answers were used to obtain the "normal" level of responses. In every area, both groups were above the purported normal average for the test (a T-score of 50), as is commonly true of seminarians and other student groups.
2. The difference in scores between the two groups was statistically significant (.05 level) in area 8 (Sc), which purports to indicate sociability-withdrawal tendencies; and was only microscopically short of statistical significance in area 7 (Pt), which purports to measure the level of compulsive-perfectionistic tendencies. In both areas the persevering group showed better adjustment. (The foregoing results were obtained with regular scoring employing the K-correction.)

Interestingly, when the raw scores without K-correction were employed to work out the profile, the successful group had significantly lower scores not only in area 7 (Pt) and 8 (Sc), but also in area 4 (Pd), which purports to measure tendency to independence, and also in the validating F scale.

3. The significant differences in areas 8 and 7 (Sc and Pt) would indicate that the successful candidates tend to be more sociable and less perfectionistic, or scrupulous, than the non-persevering candidates. The difference in area 4 (Pd) would indicate that the persevering candidate tends to be more docile, less independent and critical. But there was no patterning of scores that would enable the psychologist to predict with substantial success, on the basis of elevated areas, that this particular candidate would persevere or drop out.
4. Many studies of screening tests have attempted to establish a cutting-point based on the average of all the clinical area scores. No such cutting point could be established to segregate successful from unsuccessful candidates. An average of 60.6 for all the clinical T-scores would cut off 20 percent of all the future dropouts; but it would also falsely cut off 12 percent of the candidates who will persevere. In other words, 12 percent of the 126 who went on the priesthood or perpetual profession had an average score higher than 60.6.
5. A T-score of 70 is customarily interpreted as abnormally high in each area of the MMPI. When the Notre Dame testing program was inaugurated in 1953, it was assumed that the level of T-score 70 would

be a tip-off on emotional disturbances that would render the candidates unsuitable. But the ten years of testing disclosed that exactly half of the candidates who drop out of training produced no abnormally high scores whatever; all their scores were within the "normal" range, below the level of 70. Moreover, 40 percent of those who persevered to priesthood produced at least one T-score of 70 or over; 31 had a single score of 70 or over; 21 had two or more; five had at least three; and two had four scales of 70 or over.

The presence of elevated scores, however, is not without meaning. Ten out of 11 of those who had three or more scales of 70 dropped out, seven out of 10 of those who produced two scales of 70 dropped out. But only 14 percent of those who dropped out produced three scales of 70; 20 percent of those who dropped out showed two clinical scales of 70—but 22 percent of those who persevered also produced two scales of 70 or over, so that this criterion is useless to predict success or failure.

6. The conclusion from this brief survey of the results of testing twenty classes of seminarians before entrance into the novitiate is that while an abnormally high score on the MMPI may indicate emotional difficulties, it does not indicate sufficient disturbance to predict that the candidate will discontinue or be dismissed from the training for religious priesthood in this institute.

THE MMPI IS A DIAGNOSTIC INSTRUMENT, NOT A SCREENING DEVICE

What emerges from the ten years of testing is that the MMPI is not effective as a predictor of perseverance or non-perseverance. In fact, its authors have repeatedly warned that it was not designed for that purpose; it is an instrument designed to diagnose emotional disturbance.

The emotional pressures that are detected by the MMPI were not a determining factor in the perseverance of candidates. Some candidates with quite pronounced emotional conflicts are approved by faculty vote and accepted into perpetual profession and priesthood. This does not prove that they may not succumb to anxieties and pressures in the years ahead; it only shows that despite emotional conflicts they can survive the course of studies and training and be approved by faculty vote—which cannot be favorable unless the faculty member is morally certain that the candidate is qualified to serve adequately as a priest.

FAKING GOOD, OR ROLE-PLAYING THE "MODEL CANDIDATE"

In the Notre Dame testing program, some of the candidates who were dismissed for obvious emotional maladjustment gave no evidence of their problems in the MMPI record. Moreover, many of the seminarians voiced resentment against the questions of the MMPI, which they felt had been designed for a very different clientele than applicants for religious priesthood. Some were resentful of the entire compulsory testing program in spite of the fact that they had been assured that the tests were not used to reject them and test results had never been used to screen out applicants; they were in fact referred to only by a superior in cases where the candidate developed distinct outward evidences of emotional maladjustment.

To find out what had been the test-taking attitude of those who had persevered in training, a questionnaire was designed, to be answered anonymously, and distributed informally among those who volunteered to answer. About half of the successful candidates responded; their evaluation of the testing was from three to ten years after they had been tested.

The sampling of subjects discloses that they are somewhat divided in their evaluation of the MMPI. Half of them indicate that their answers to the test questions had been spontaneous and straightforward. The other half indicate that they had tended to role-play the "good seminarian" in their responses, and their test-taking attitude had influenced the profile because they suspected that the test results would be used as a screening device for initial acceptance and for later advancement to profession and orders. One-third of the subjects thought that the MMPI was ineffective to give a true picture of adjustment in seminarians, at least in the framework of current attitude toward the testing program. About one-third expressed the view that the testing would be very useful if employed by trained seminary staff to assist the candidates in spiritual direction.

HOW ACCURATE IS A FACULTY RATING OF CANDIDATES?

It is a common view among those who oppose psychological testing, either because it violates rights of privacy or because the results are not trustworthy, that there is nothing that compares for accuracy with the judgment of the faculty. Ten members of the faculties that had trained the subjects of the Notre Dame testing program were asked to rate the candidates, reconstructing their evaluation as of the time when the candidates took the psychological tests, on a 5-point scale, namely, very poor risk to persevere, below average, average, above average, and excellent risk to persevere. This rating was necessarily retrospective in nature, and obviously it is liable to the suspicion that the raters' recollection of their judgment might be influenced by their factual knowledge of the success or failure of the candidate.

For whatever instructive value there may be in it, a random sampling of candidates rated by at least four faculty members showed these results: of 50 successful candidates, 84 percent were rated above average risk, 16 percent were rated below average risk to persevere. Of 50 candidates who had dropped out, 70 percent were rated below average risk, 30 percent were rated above average. A candid appraisal of this performance must conclude that this is not a phenomenal degree of accuracy.

By way of loose cross-check on the faculty ratings, between the time of the faculty ratings and the time of the completion of the study there were 13 dropouts among those in temporary vows; these candidates had passed through a year of novitiate and at least one year of temporary vows; of the 13, 9 had been rated above average risk by the faculty, only 4 were judged to be below average. This might suggest that the faculty are able to pick out those who are liable not to persevere through the novitiate year; but their rating seems not to be sensitive enough to distinguish those who might survive the religious-oriented year of noviceship but not persevere through the education-oriented training thereafter.

The conclusion that I am led to, however, is that however much one might question the reliability of psychological testing, he cannot appeal to the faculty ratings as a secure guide, either on the likelihood of perseverance or on the emotional adjustment suitable for effective apostolate.

KUDER INTEREST AREAS SHOWN BY THE TESTING

The Kuder tests produced almost identical interest patterns among those who persevered and those who dropped out of training. There was a barely significant difference in one area: the successful seminarians showed a higher interest in computational matters. It is likely that this difference is closely correlated with the over-all intelligence ratings; but this correlation has not been worked out statistically.

Because of the closeness of interest patterns, it was not possible to show any combination of Kuder and MMPI scales that would serve as a criterion of success or non-perseverance in training.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The foregoing considerations have led me to the practical conclusion that a compulsory screening-test program, involuntarily taken by the candidates, tends to defeat its own purpose, and is an unwarranted imposition on the good nature of the candidates.

It is my recommendation that there should definitely be an assessment testing program wherever the seminary or religious institute is capable of providing one. Although the institution is within its rights in compelling candidates to submit to testing as a condition for admission, the compulsory test tends to create the defense reaction of role-playing or presenting the idealized self. It would be preferable if the candidates were encouraged to take the tests, but were left free to decide for themselves.

It would be preferable if the testing could be done individually. A group-testing program has a tendency, in my experience, to defeat itself, creating the atmosphere of compulsory testing; it is easy for the defensive candidate or the test-sophisticated candidate to role-play the model aspirant, and group-testing profiles must always be suspect for faking good. Individual testing is costly and time consuming, but it is by far the most reliable. The mass-production test battery makes both the well-adjusted candidate and the neurotic-defensive candidate look like paragons of normality, one because he is spontaneous, the other because he has faked good.

The candidates must be carefully prepared for the testing, otherwise they will try to beat the test. They must be persuaded that the results will not be used to screen out but to help them to improve their personality, to get better spiritual direction and personal counseling where it is needed.

The distinct limitations of the test instruments must be recognized. They are subject to the influence of dozens of uncontrolled variables, such as mood, health, momentary discouragement, over-confidence, and the natural tendency to present the most appealing side of one's personality. The tests require expert interpretation by highly competent evaluators. They must not be allowed to fall into the hands of untrained staff personnel who might tend to be over-alarmed or to confirm personal suspicions about the character of the aspirants.

Every testing program is launched with high optimism. We need the experience of many years, plus candid reporting, to enable us to improve the art of personality testing and to give us reliable judgments about the effectiveness of testing for suitability of candidates for priesthood and religious life.

FOOTNOTES

1. POPE PIUS XII, "Allocution on Applied Psychology," April 10, 1958, reported in *The Pope Speaks*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1958, p. 18. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 50 (1958) 280.
2. Cf. FORD, JOHN C., S.J., *Religious Superiors, Subjects, and Psychiatrists*, Newman Press, 1963, p. 67 ff.
3. SWEENEY R. H., C.S.C., "Testing Seminarians with MMPI and Kuder: A Report of Ten Years of Testing," unpublished thesis, Loyola University, Chicago, Ill., 1964. The author is preparing an abbreviated version for publication.
4. Cf. JACKSON, D.N., and Sam. Messick, "Response Styles on the MMPI," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 65 (1962), n.5, 285-299.
5. POPE PIUS XII, Apostolic Constitution *Sedes Sapientiae*.
6. BIER, WM. C., S.J., "Testing Procedures and Their Values," Proceedings of the 1959 Sisters' Institute of Spirituality. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1960.
7. KOBLER, FRANK J., "Screening Applicants for Religious Life," *Journal of Religion and Health*, Vol. 3, No. 2, January, 1964.
8. GREENWALD, ALAN F., "Psychological Assessment of Religious Aspirants," *Review for Religious*, May, 1963, p. 298.
9. BIER, WM. C., S.H., "Practical Requirements for a Program for the Psychological Screening of Applicants," *Review for Religious*, XIII (1954), 13-27.
10. POPE PIUS XII, "Applied Psychology," in *The Pope Speaks*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1958, p. 18 ff.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 18. In A.A.S., 50 (1958), p. 280.
12. Cf. FORD, JOHN C., S.J., *Religious Superiors, Subjects, and Psychiatrists*. (Newman, 1963) p. 43.
13. HERR, VINCENT V., S.J., "Mental Health Training in Catholic Seminaries," *Journal of Religion and Health*, Vol. 1, 1962, p. 140.

Modern Youth and the Vocational Challenge

BROTHER GERMANUS BURNS, C.S.C.

Director of Guidance, Holy Cross High School, Flushing, N.Y.

THE TITLE OF MY TALK seems to presume that we have to present to our somewhat overly touted modern youth a vocational challenge which is significantly different from that, say, which Cardinal Newman might have offered to a nineteenth century audience, or that Francis de Sales might have felt compelled to use with his contemporary powdered dandies. But the question persists in a haunting kind of way: How much do men really change as the universe spins its multiple generations? How much do they alter in any fundamental way?

Their desires vary, of course, depending on whatever is available to satisfy

and entice them, but the basic needs and drives remain pretty much the same from age to age: the need to love, and (though some grow prim at the suggestion) the need to hate; the need to cherish, and the need to abandon; to create and to destroy; to worship and to sacrifice; to adore and to immolate. These are indigenous to the nature of man. They belong to the human nature of the twentieth century sophisticate with the same inevitability (if not the same degree of refinement) that they had in the uncomplex Neanderthal.

Since the whole challenge of the religious and priestly life is aimed at the exploitation and the channeling of these needs toward their fulfillment in the divine economy and the perfection of mankind, then ideally we could end all discussion with the conclusion that it needs no alterations to exercise its ancient magnetism on the youthful moderns of our time. However, logic has always had more head than heart, and we must consider the grim reality of statistics.

The conclusion is that somewhere in the neighborhood of one fourth of the religious communities in this country and in Canada have experienced a notable decrease in the number of aspirants during the past two decades, even to the point where it has been necessary for them to relinquish certain aspects of their apostolate. (The situation in Europe is staggeringly worse.)

Significantly, among the communities which have experienced the greatest vocational boom, certain of the contemplative and semi-cloistered orders continue to enjoy an enviable edge. Even more significantly, some recent analyses of vocational increase among priests, brothers, and sisters indicate that vocations to the religious brotherhoods are the only ones that have kept a proportional pace with the per capita population increase.

There is something startling about this fact. Certainly, it is at least unexpected that in an era like ours, with its devotion to prestige and the security of status, the purposeful obscurity of the religious brotherhood demanding, as it does, such massive relinquishments, would hold any great appeal for the modern mentality and even less for our socialized spirituality. But the fact remains that it apparently does. And herein lies, perhaps, at least a part of the answer to what it is that modern youth is seeking in monasticism and in the priesthood.

I would be accused of romanticism or worse if I suggested that it might be repetition of a history which has come full cycle, a small-scale resurgence of that touch of divine madness which, in the buoyant early days of the Church, left the elders aghast with disapproval as thousands of youths rushed headlong into the desert, magnificently naked of everything the world considered vital, including its own approbation. The magnanimity of their gesture, the abandoned, extravagant courage of it, was completely lost, of course, on most of their contemporaries, including such churchmen as Augustine who was never quite sure that he approved of it. And the philosophic Rutilius saw nothing more in their sacrifice than the frightened scuffling of ineffectual rodents hastening to abandon the sinking ship of a dying, degenerate Empire.

Certainly, anyone who has ever had to deal with boys preparing to enter the brotherhood (and to a lesser extent those who are heading for contemplative cloisters which have lately captured the public imagination and with it public approval) will easily admit that, from the point of view of motive, a comparison between the twentieth century brother and the ancient Egyptian anchorites is no very daring analogy. He has too many memories

of disappointed clerics who—in all good faith, no doubt—find it hard to understand the impulsion involved in the choice of a life so stripped of adornment; of sincerely ambitious parish-school sisters dissolved in confusion because they had envisioned “this” boy as a bishop or better; of parents and relatives so often mystified, and even sometimes embarrassed, that the boy should choose (because it is rarely remembered that he has been divinely *chosen for*) so barren a way of life and one so little recognized as worthy of his talents.

The exception? No, pretty much the rule, even if it is not always openly expressed. This is the way it has been for those of us who are brothers; this is the way it will go on being for most of those who will join us, and when we recall how closely it parallels the world’s reception of Christ and His mission, we are not inclined to have it any other way.

Maybe the modern mind of youth, surfeited with excess, needs the catharsis involved in the right to reject the secularities of the material world without being recompensed with a whole new series of secular values arbitrarily raised to a different degree. The religious vocational literature, so much of it, is bloated with the high-flown sales pitch: Be a man among men; a leader of men; a second Florence Nightingale forging through the masses of a deprived humanity humbly waiting for your ministrations. And learn how to accomplish these wonderful feats in our modernly equipped formation houses ideally located in spacious areas with rolling lawns and playing fields and swimming pools and gracious companions.

Perhaps we promise them too much that is far too similar to what they can have far easier in the world. Or, worse still, perhaps we promise them too little. It is scarcely the kind of gauntlet that would fire the blood of an Ignatius or a Dominic, Francis Xavier or Mother Seton, and it isn’t too likely to expand the cockles of the best and strongest hearts among our youth.

Is it possible that we are underestimating the young, and so offering them a challenge which has lost its rapier point? We could be led to do that very easily, you know, blinded by the almost ceaseless barrage of analytical psychologizing about them—about the norms and the customs of a tense and inward generation, old without age, aggressive, suspicious, accusative, insecure—a fascinating, challenging, and potential generation.

Any prudent adult is inclined to tread softly when he talks about the young. There is always such an unconscious tendency to slip into the nostalgia of wondering “why can’t they be like we were, perfect in every way?” The battle of the generations, you know, probably (and apocryphally) began when Adam first stormed in on Eve and thundered, “What’s got into those sons of yours? They can’t get along with each other at all.” Even the gentle Socrates complained in the *Dialogues* that the youth of his day had grown lazy and crass, disobedient and flighty.

Today—perhaps more than ever—the spirit of rebellion has become a spirit of defiance, manifested in destruction and violence. We must remember—and we cannot forget—such inglorious exhibitions as the student riots in Japan at Eisenhower’s Tokyo visit, and the similar South American demonstration of students against Richard Nixon; the ten thousand Indonesians (not a one over twenty) who burned the British Embassy at Jakarta; the terrifying Viet Cong with its 85 percent complement of teen-age fighters; the American Ivy League college riots of last spring (a rebellion certainly without cause) in which dozens of innocent adults were seriously injured by ram-

pagings students who smashed railroad cars, toppled public buses and private automobiles, and beat off the police with clubs and chains. It was youngsters in their teens last August who violently disrupted the House Committee on Un-American Activities protesting the United States ban on travel to Cuba, and it was the teen-age crowd who uncorked the lid that set Panama aflame and that turned the Newport Music Festival into a raging no-man's-land.

What in the world has gotten into them? Well, what has gotten into them is something that the adults of the last several centuries should have protected them from, but didn't.

It was not the work of the young to stop this mayhem of the race, which in fact saw its first rumble in the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century. The young were not permitted to have a voice in weighty matters. That belonged to their elders, and their elders were unequal to the task.

Certainly, I don't favor youthful violence and insubordination, but after thirteen years as a guidance counselor to youth there are times when I could gladly flail a club and join their angry ranks. They have more than a few grounds for complaint. However, let them speak for themselves. Recently a New York journalist, Lloyd Shearer, toured the country on an interview assignment to find out where exactly modern youth stands in relation to adults. They are not happy with us. Granted they have established in society what has been aptly called "a teen-age tyranny," they were penetratingly articulate in giving Shearer reasons why. The following are actual quotes:

"You think of everything in terms of money; there doesn't seem to be any other value for you."

"You adults are all status happy. You preach one set of values and practice another."

"You've given us a sex-oriented culture. Everything in this country reeks of sex, and yet you burn us for our immorality. We're more moral than you are; at least we're honest about what we're doing."

"We're accustomed now to the fact that almost everything we do raises adult eyebrows and blood pressures. They don't approve of us. They complain about our taste in music and dancing; they groan over teen stars like the Beatles and the Beach Boys, and they rant about our clothes. But who writes the music we listen to? Who publishes it and sells it? Who are the agents for the teen-age singing groups? Who engineers their recording sessions, plugs them on radio, gives them video and TV time? Who designs the clothes we wear, cuts the patterns, and puts them on display? Who sets up the dirty reading stacks in drug stores and candy shops? Who sells us contraceptives?

"It's the adults who do these things, the synthetic, money-grabbing adults with their platitudes and their double standards living like parasites off the blood of the teen-agers."¹

Admittedly not all the young moderns think along these lines. Some of them never seem to think at all in any significant way. Others either see no problem worth their passion, or they have been felled altogether by the deadly blight of passive acquiescence.

Unfortunately these latter too often become the "good" little boys and girls, the ones who give no trouble, raise no problems, never create an inci-

¹ Quoted from L.I. *Sunday Press*, July 14, 1963.

dent, never verbalize a statement that startles or shocks—or gives us pause to reflect and perhaps to feel guilty. They are the cautious ones (or maybe the indifferent) who leave us our complacency; they are so comforting because they make no demands on us beyond what we are inclined to give, and so they permit us to enjoy the fulsome feeling that we are giving all that is needed.

There is no intent here to write off the virtuous, docile youngster, and certainly none to laud the crassly aggressive or rabble-rousing type. We want only to point up the fact that docility is no imbecilic virtue, mute, bovine, supinely acquiescent. It is a rational virtue, and like every other Christian virtue, it is supposed to augment that militant confidence, that virile integrity which is God's gift in Confirmation. Militance and virility are the qualities which are too frequently lacking in many of the supernaturally good young people of our day.

And we permit this passivity. There are times when we may even encourage it in our Catholic school system. It is so much easier to control the zestful young when we condition them to believe that "children should be seen and not heard." It is so much less bothersome when we convince ourselves that the school is a place for intellection not to be bastardized by intrusions which belong to the home, the church, the diocese, or whatever. Cliché though it is, we need to be reminded that we are not simply training minds in our classrooms; we are moulding men and women for the Kingdom of God, a part of which includes His divinely omnipotent rights over everything on earth.

Oh, we may occasionally lecture our students about their responsibilities toward the lay apostolate, the YCS, the YCW and the CFM, the Grail, the Peace Corps and the Papal Volunteers, but do we *do* anything about them, anything beyond mere formalism, that is? Do we throw ourselves completely into the work of training our modern youngsters, as any decent army would, for the kind of modern battling they must do in our modern world? Better still, do we occasionally walk with them into the market places of the world where the ideological wars are won or lost and show them now it's done?

And what has all this to do with the vocational challenge that we began with so boldly and seem to have misplaced?

In the beginning, we pointed out that the whole challenge of the priestly and religious life is aimed at the channeling of man's fundamental drives toward their fulfillment in the divine economy and the perfection of mankind. In others words, just as some have a vocation to medicine, others to law, we have a vocation to love, the most unique and absorbing profession on earth.

If we have analyzed the restless and frustrated passion of our modern youth correctly here, and if, as Maturin points out, the intensity of the power of hating is always in proportion to the power of loving, then many of our current youth have a vast capacity for love, a love which is inflamed by limits—not satisfied by them—a love which can be fully consummated only in the kind of intense immolation which belongs to the world of the spirit. Its closest parallel may very well be found in that love yearning toward truth which stripped the early martyrs of all expedience and caution as they died grandly for and in defiance of a rotting and pagan world.

The fields, then, seem ripe for the harvest, the weather is propitious and the time is right. If the crop is poor, let's look first to the husbandmen, not because all the fault is going to be localized there, but some of it

must be. We're not the ones who planted the seed, but we have been set to cultivate it and to guard its growth. We are the ones who, before God, are responsible for eternal vigilance over it.

I have not been connected with religious vocational work for the past several years, but occasionally a boy who is toying with the idea of priesthood or cloister will come to discuss it in the vague, indefinite way they have. And do you know the question I get oftenest from them, in one form or another? It's this: "What do the brothers do after school closes down at 2:30? Most of them disappear right away. How do they fill in their time in that house up there?"

Granted it is a childish question about a profound subject, but it does seem to have a bit of significance; it might even have a shattering one. They are not at all appalled at five or six hours of head-spinning labor in the classroom, the wearying priestly sojourns in the confessional, the self-discipline we must exercise for the daily administration and reception of the sacraments. These they feel adequate to cope with.

But they are afraid of being bored in the service of God! Their lives are already so often blank with the boredom of goals not much worth achieving that the thought of assuming another dull burden, lifelong and irrevocable, is repugnant altogether.

The interesting question is: How have they ever come to conceptualize the religious life and the priesthood so pallidly? Can it be that they think of us as boring people, or even worse, as people who are bored? If so, where did they get these devastating notions? From us? Because this is precisely what we are? Or from us because this is the image that we have somehow created for them?

Have you ever had the experience of listening to a group of youngsters discussing a particularly volatile, gay, outgoing, energetic member of the faculty or parish house? I have, a dozen times, and every recurrence is a galling experience. "Man," they blandly emote, "How did he [or she] ever become a priest [or religious]?" This is a tragic dichotomy they make, this inevitable separation between the joy of the man and his divine consecration, as though the two could exist only by contradiction. Evidently they have very little notion of what it really means to be a religious or priest; of what is involved in holocaust; of celibate love; of the search for perfection; of the inward joy which is the mark of maturation in the spiritual life even when every outward member is tortured in that furnace of fire where God has promised to try His acceptable man.

May I suggest what is no new suggestion in this day of kerygmatic thinking. It is conceivable that we are losing fertile ground in our training of the young with too much concentration on moral technicalities, apologetic niceties, and the social virtues; all the somewhat defensive and titillating, and, incidentally, easy-to-teach approaches, while the hard realities of the ascetical life, the blueprint of Christian living, take a seat at the foot of the table.

What do they really know, these boys and girls of ours, of the kind of joy that is completer on Calvary than it ever was on Palm Sunday? What do they know of sacrifice, not in a theoretical sense, but in the pain of their own spirit with scars to show for it?

They cannot learn to assimilate with generosity and peace the dual properties of asceticism—the harshness and the joy—simply by hearing about them sporadically. They have to be *trained* in them, even perhaps under

supervision (though not, certainly, under duress) as the surgeon must be trained to control the tremble in hands that deal at times in jeopardy.

They should know the great battlers in the war against self, their lives and their fantastic conquests, as surely as they know Shakespeare and Franklin and Edgar Allan Poe. If they can never distinguish a Nestorian from a Manichean, it doesn't matter much. But if, after eight or twelve or sixteen years of association with us, the salt who should savor the earth, they still don't know with an effervescent and effective knowledge, what it was that expanded the hearts and divinized the humanity of Francis de Sales and Philip Neri, of Therese of Lisieux and the Curé of Ars, of Maria Goretti and Mary Magdalene, then it matters very much, indeed. St. Bernard once said that if the multitudes of the world only knew the subtle joys of our monastic life, they would siege the gates of our cloisters. That being the case, let's go out and tell them about it.

Do we need mellifluous words for the task? I don't know. They have their place. There is a passage from Waddell's description of the old Egyptian anchorites that would substitute effectively and well: "Of the depths of their spiritual experience they had little to say; but their every action showed a standard of values that turns the world upside down. It was their humility, their gentleness, their heart-breaking courtesy that was the seal of their sanctity to their contemporaries, far beyond abstinence or miracle or sign."²

And so to conclude with the inevitable frustration of feeling that too much has been left unsaid and unsolved.

The element of mystery in divine vocation—added to the fact that I have very meager credentials for speaking on the subject—has posed a problem, if not formidable, at least uncomfortable. In fact, if an autobiographical intrusion is permissible, I would like to inject the remnant of a myth that I thought had safely died some years ago when I was changed from a school where I had been local vocational director for five or six years.

During those years, an unusually large number of boys, quite entirely of their own volition and with the usual nudging of grace, decided to enter the priesthood or the brotherhood. Consequently the word got around, at least areawise, that I was some sort of wingding recruiter, a kind of Pied Piper tootling souls to the cloister. This might have been flattering if it had not been accompanied by an increasing volume of letters from other local directors asking me to share with them my "holy tricks and gimmicks."

It was an impossible request of course. I had no system; I had no gimmicks, no tricks, no piper's horn, not even the natural magnetism that made Don Bosco and Assisi and the late Daniel Lord such fantastic propagandists. I never tried to sell the religious life to anybody, mainly because it is not a salable product to begin with. It is a divine gratuity, something to be given away, a free gift from Almighty God, and the profound mystery of its offering is equalled only in the mystery of its acceptance by the individual soul.

What I *did* have during those years was an undersized office with an oversized desk, two unmatched chairs that claimed neither comfort nor beauty, a door that was always open to any youngster who felt like passing through it, and a contagious hope that the line of visitors would be endless. The boys caught the contagion and came. Since I also functioned as Director

² Helen Waddell, *The Desert Fathers*, p. 11.

of Guidance and Psychological Examiner, the parade of problems through that open door was rich and varied.

Among them, of course, came the religious and priestly vocational problems, because, as you soon discover when you work with the young, a vast number of them, touched with the grace of vocation, grow numb. They seem to regard the divine invitation more as a burden to be wrestled with than as a charismatic joy to revel in.

Where the problem does lie, though, is in the solution of it by so many of our young in favor of themselves, against the munificent hopes of God. Considering the vast needs of Holy Mother Church in every part of the globe, there seems little room to doubt that thousands of our boys and girls must be resisting vocations to the Church, or at least establishing habits of reaction that make it too difficult for them to respond to vocational challenge.

So, once more, briefly we turn to introspection, a final inward glance. There is nothing we can do, thank God, to force the human will to submission in this matter; at least nothing we can properly do. But, perhaps, there is still a good bit that needs doing (a new approach, or at least some new thinking about old approaches) to renovate the spirit of generosity in the young we help to mold; to abandon a rising tendency we have these days to accept youth's generosity on its own terms, and so demand too little from them; to resurrect the sense of what it means to be one's brother's keeper in a narcissistic and self-centered world.

Whenever I think along these lines, I recall a very fateful day in that miniature office when five not-too-certain-they-were-glad-to-be-there youngsters stood before the desk and said, "O.K. We'll give it a try." They were all in their fifteenth year and sophomores, and they represented the total response to a school-wide plea for volunteers who would inaugurate a Catholic Action unit. Apparently, the pitch for volunteers had been a little too enthusiastic, and the standards for membership set a good deal higher than most of the students felt secure enough to reach.

At any rate, only five showed up; but five, you know, is an army if they have the kind of spirit that can meet what Fulton Sheen likes to call "the test of Golgotha." These particular five were swiftly tested. Their first official meeting on a vicious night in mid-January coincided with a very New England blizzard. Wind, ice, snow, and violent temperatures (all the elements that only mad dogs and Englishmen would ever venture out in) made their trip to the meeting a refined misery. Only three of the five attempted it.

Before that evening ended, the three had drafted a terse, demanding Constitution which charitably but firmly eliminated the absent two who had collapsed before the challenge of the weather, and they established a motif of sacrificial leadership which would shortly make their nascent unit the most coveted organization in the school. The day came when boys of every talent and temperament, shape and build, would plead for membership with them.

As their motto, they adopted a brief but powerful statement of position: "May Your Will, my Lord, be done on earth today, and may I be the one who does it," and they expected every member to drain the significance of that pledge right down to every consequential dreg.

They established a pattern of activity so forcefully demanding that, by any modern standards, it should have toppled their unit in a month: Bluntly, they set themselves to publicly profess everything that is commonly understood by that abominable teen-age cuss word: "square." Steady daters who wanted to join them were forced to break off their precipitate unions, and

they did it with a good deal of youthful pain. Meetings were scheduled for Saturday nights and began with the chanting of Compline; therefore, no Saturday dates, parties, canteen dances, for anyone in membership. Friday nights were spent with the Sisters of the Poor, reading to the aged, showing movies, producing skits, washing windows, waxing floors, changing beds. During the week they tutored fellow students deficient in grades; taught Religion to released-time public schoolers; applied what Christian ointment they could to environmental problems they had been assigned to during their previous sectional meetings. They handled all the Freshman orientation; used their own cars to chauffeur underclassmen to class dances and activities; worked quietly for months through a barrage of disappointments until they had the boys at every table in the "caf" saying their own private grace before meals.

They felt that religious vocations needed a boost, so they bombarded the student body until they finally had a smooth-running system by which one boy from each of the four classes went to Mass and Communion every day of the week for this intention from September to June. Prayer, they knew, was the vital starch that would strengthen the spirit of the school, so they found an old room at the top of the building, painted the walls, built with their own hands a couple of rickety prie dieus, bought a statue of Our Lady, and began what they called the Perpetual Rosary—four boys at every period of the day saying consecutive rosaries there as the representative before God of their fellow students in the school.

To raise the standards of student taste, they began a monthly assembly program, handled it themselves. They enticed to the school the most amazingly disparate collection of people and things: Shakespearean actors, operatic coloraturas, symphony orchestras and jazz bands, authors, politicians, missionaries, well-known theatrical people. Long before the Ecumenical Movement, they were holding open forums with the Youth Section of the Lutheran League and groups of non-Christian liberals from area universities.

However, beneath and much beyond all their grandiose accomplishments, the most important, and in many cases the most disheartening, work of all was going on; the quiet, unobtrusive infiltration of them into every group and clique, every faction and organization in the school, scattering their own spirit and their own ideals into every crevasse of the environments they touched. Here, it was no longer a matter of sacrifice simply in time and energy. They had to reach deep into themselves for pockets of patience, of tolerance, of ingenuity and tact, and, above all, they had to find somewhere in their spirit that firm humility which can withstand a thousand rebuffs, because they got them from every side, including the side they least expected and were least prepared to meet—some religious who misunderstood them.

Only God, I imagine, will ever know what conquers these youngsters made, not only over others, but strongly over themselves, and they would be the first to say that they are willing to leave it to God. It was they, far more than I, who fostered the resurgence of religious and priestly vocations. From their ranks alone came a steady stream of them. And why wouldn't it be so? They had the kind of strong and vital hearts that had learned to beat an incessant "Yes" to stern demands. They were no strangers to sacrifice and generosity. A little pain was for them no bogey to be shied away from in terror. They had learned its value in the divine economy and its effectiveness in the human.

So, perhaps, modern youth is not so much afraid of the challenge of the cloister and the priesthood as they are unaware of it. Perhaps they are simply waiting to see its traces more clearly in the activity of those who have embraced and proclaimed the challenge. They are not so dreadfully attached to their world, you know, with its empty symbols of sex and wealth competitive prestige. As Zundel so wonderfully expresses the idea, they have all reached out to feel the fabric of their world, and of what they have grasped they retain as much as a child retains who tries to seize the iridescence of a soap bubble.

They will never be satisfied with it.

Pastoral Approach in the Vocation Apostolate

REV. JOHN R. MADDEN

Assistant Pastor, St. Mary's Church, Clinton, N.Y.

"The harvest is great, but the laborers few—go you also into the vineyard. I am the true vine, and my Father the vinedresser. Every branch that bears fruit, he will prune that it will bear more fruit."

We are concerned with the birth of a religious vocation. We cannot doubt for a moment that the Father has provided the vocations. They have been conceived in the Eternal Mind—but they must be brought to fruition. During the embryonic growth the seed of a vocation proceeds with the usual course of nature. But the actual birth must be attended. Unusual, deviant, and unexpected factors must be realistically anticipated, and an expert, therefore, should be in attendance. Appropriate skill, then, must cultivate and nurture the seedling that it may be guided and strengthened in the branch.

The parish priest normally fulfills this delicate role. He encounters the youthful aspirant in the normal settings of home, parish, and school. The assistant pastor, usually because of his younger interests and, more likely, because of his delegated duties, engages the parish youth more frequently in his apostolate.

The younger priest, along with his older colleagues, realizes the urgency of replenishing the ranks of religious life. He must candidly agree with St. Paul when he asks: "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how are they to hear, if no one preaches? And how are men to preach unless they be sent?" Obviously, the candidates must be recruited if they are to be sent. The miracles of grace depend upon human instrumentality—for grace builds upon nature. It's a fact, we can tell our youth "*God has need of you*" to accomplish His works.

Certainly, if grace will never coerce nature, it surely will perfect nature. God needs the assistant pastor, among others, to achieve that perfection. Filled with the necessity of his task, the parish priest will conscientiously acquire the skill to prune the branch so that it will bear more fruit in the religious life. Skills and prayerful dedication will urge and assist the priest in

"getting vocations," but the greatest factor in yielding a vocation is to let the priest of dedication reveal and reflect himself and his priceless contentment.

How best can the youthful prospect see this genuine and tranquil satisfaction. Contact—contact is the clue. The priest must possess the virtue of "availability." How blessed the assistant pastor is to possess the avenues of access. The priest becomes the contact man for the Holy Spirit. The priest, indeed, has a passkey to every home, for he is "a member of each family, yet belonging to none."

Home visitation is invaluable. Whether it be one of the endless census calls, or arranging for a Communion call, or at a time of bereavement, or the occasion of a graduation, or he is there seeking a favor, or planning with some society officers, or whatever the reason might be, the priest has no need of ingenious methods to view the home—from the inside. He has easy access. So often, of course, there is fidgety awkwardness, but this can soon give way to relaxed cordiality. Without sacrificing familiarity, the priest enjoys ease in the sanctuaries of the parish homes. From this vantage point, the priest views the family circle with keen perception and, in turn, allows a true reflection of his own priestly character. The people, young and old, must know us, and we must know them in their real setting.

A priest's presence in a home must be governed by prudence. His visit must be ever meaningful. Where potential vocations reside, he must project the image of an intelligent, devoted, efficient, and generous religious life. The interested efforts of a priest in a home can bring blessings that deserve a response. The richest of those dividends, we pray, will indeed be an enthusiasm for the religious life itself.

Our generation has witnessed with glowing admiration two men named John. Both captured the heart of the world. Their ages, their backgrounds, their magnificent roles were quite diverse, but they both projected enthusiasm. Their brilliant example has not gone unnoticed by our youth. Pope John and John F. Kennedy were men with intelligence and sensitivity; they were ambassadors with rapport and humor; they were dedicated servants with efficiency and generosity. Their splendid natural qualities, we should like to believe, were characterized by the spirit of which St. Paul speaks: *Caritas Christi urget nos*.

How often we view these beautiful natural qualities in many of the young people in our parishes. They are qualities which can be used for leadership, salesmanship, and every area of responsible adulthood. They are those same qualities of intelligence, sensitivity, rapport, humor, efficiency, and generosity.

Perhaps our role, above all else, is to inject the *Caritas Christi* to inspire their dedication and to help them fashion in their character mature dependability. We must help them clarify their first inklings and, further, help them to courageously respond to that call of Christ that all too often falls upon indifferent ears.

These occasions of grace can be felt at various levels. The time of confirmation is an ideal occasion to present a strong appeal to our boys and girls. The liturgy of this sacrament powerfully dramatizes the role of the Holy Spirit. The special instructions, the prestige of the sacrament, the thrilling anticipation and growing fervor, and the splendor of the sacrament being conferred are exciting moments of grace.

The priests, sisters, and laymen who prepare these children should emphasize the role of every Christian for witnessing Christ, and, above all,

the special apostolate of the religious life and the priesthood. All this becomes a fitting prelude to the bishop's arrival and his inspiring presence. At this early age we can capture their hearts and their enthusiastic desire to become responsible young members in the Mystical Body of Christ, a role each must play, and from this a consciousness of Christ's need of them as apostles. Some youngsters will decide on a more complete dedication to this apostolate through the priesthood and the religious life.

A special point of contact with boys for the assistant pastor is the training of altar boys. We may interpret their young ambition to serve as perhaps their very first voluntary act of dedication. Once a young boy establishes this official bond with the priest it may certainly grow. A beautiful intimacy develops with the priests of the parish as the altar boys offer the tribute of their services so close to the tabernacle. The priest may let them see at close range reverence for our sacred rites. The young mind often eavesdrops on the priests as parishioners incessantly drop into the sacristy. He sees first hand the interest, patience, and kindness of the priest in even the simple chores as he blesses a medal or conducts a lost-and-found department.

If youngsters are quick to notice inconsistency when a priest is irreverent, they must be just as observant and impressed by the reverent priest in action.

Choir boys enjoy a similar opportunity to view the Church and her priests at close range. And the priest should enjoy their presence and show his appreciation for their generous and persevering talents. These are occasions to shed influence over another group of dedicated boys.

There can be times of good-hearted enjoyment and this can be achieved reasonably and courteously. Opportunities for complete recreation are thoroughly enjoyed by the priest as well as by the youngsters. Because the boys have involved themselves in noteworthy parish functions as altar boys or choir boys, they have the further occasion of enjoying themselves with their priests at concerts, parties, sporting events, and, of course, the traditional altar boys picnic. It is amazing and gratifying to find how often boys will take the relaxed atmosphere of a parish outing to speak of matters deep in their hearts. A lot of vocation talk can be had on a picnic!

A program that assists a priest in his vocation interest with grade-schoolers, especially girls, is known as the Bishops Vocation Club. After the children are acquainted with the program through their religion classes, they may choose to have a periodic newsletter mailed to them. In our diocese of Syracuse the children have responded tremendously. The newsletter, called "Going My Way," is attractive, and fills the youthful mind with accurate and appealing notions of the religious life. This program is pretty much between the individual and the diocesan director of vocations, but the parish priest may ideally visit with the children and complement the knowledge and inspiration given by the literature.

A parish priest with vocation interest should not overlook any activity that involves the parish youth, whether it be Little League or the 4-H Club. A priest's presence is rather expected at a Catholic school program; to reach our public school children we must exert a little effort. When our children are in Scout programs not affiliated with our Church, we must go to them, even when it means going to the Methodist Church, to address the Catholic scouts about the splendid religious awards they can earn with the priest's assistance. When the public school has open house, we should be there. We can enjoy their science fairs, their Honor Society assemblies, their games and prove ourselves interested and, above all, *available*.

As a student concludes the elementary grades and prepares for high school, we have a special opportunity to provide an essential service. This is the Junior High Retreat or Day of Recollection. This is an extremely appropriate time to help the boys and girls re-fashion their ideas of personal prayer, their use of the confessional, and their awareness of achieving mature responsibility.

Any embryonic vocation must be bolstered at this time. Adolescence can be a period of jeopardy, and we must present a feasible program for the vocation-minded. We would want them to live and enjoy an all-around happy and wholesome high school career. Let their interests turn romantic—this is par for the course. If they properly understand the normality of their vocation interest, and if they suitably adhere to a sound spiritual schedule, they may proceed with confidence, and we may watch them grow with confidence. Their daily prayer should become more meaningful and their spiritual guidance from the confessional will now be adequate because they will appreciate the all-around value of the sacrament of penance.

High school is the most fertile ground for vocation work. The most formal task the parish priest enjoys is the teaching of religion. The priest, therefore, must really teach! This role demands not only sufficient knowledge but pedagogical skill. Preparation for the Religion class is tremendously important; it could so often descend to a casual good time and be worthless. Our high school children deserve the best techniques we can supply.

The preparation, ingenuity, and discipline for Confraternity classes must be especially diligent. The student must see in our Religion classes a dignified academic stature. Our materials must be attractive, generous, and meaningful. By means of this academic setting, we can easily keep watch over their total scholastic progress and see the intellectual fitness of vocation prospects. We should guide them in their choice of subjects, especially those students in public schools. Latin and all college entrance subjects should be included in the curriculum of any vocation prospect. We can note their interest and responsiveness in all their subjects as well as their growing appreciation in religion. We can also see their social adjustment and personality development.

The high school years offer enthusiastic times for solid apostolic missions. The parish priest is the guiding force in the Sodality, the CYO, the Junior Legion of Mary, the CCD, and many other youthful endeavors. We can truly offer them apostolic opportunities and we can further provide motivation, encouragement, and guidance. We witness the development of their personal involvement in works of virtue. The seed of vocation begins to grow, and we continue to watch and cultivate and give them every opportunity to approach us with the sterling thought of their own vocation hopes. In brief, we are available when they want to make that approach.

The sacramental life of our boys and girls is a most valid index of their spiritual fitness. We must observe and guide with delicate tact. The priest has a choice opportunity in the confessional to "sound out" a possible vocation. Many at work in the vineyard today can attribute the impetus of their vocation to a timely and thoughtful remark heard in the confessional. From this pivotal point the priest can introduce the young candidate to an intensified program of personal spirituality. The time for simple mental prayer begins. Frequency at Holy Mass and Communion, and a program of spiritual reading, become effective steps in grooming the vocation. The Gospels themselves take on a wonderful new dimension.

The High School Retreat and Day of Recollection again renew the setting for a teen-ager to reflect upon his own destiny and again offer a pruning opportunity for the priest. Priests conducting these programs are vigilant for the vocation-minded and extend a further injection of motivation and perseverance.

Vocation programs are usually connected with the Religion courses, and this, of course, is logical both for the Catholic school and the Confraternity classes. But I feel one other activity should be used. Many school systems present Career Days and College Days. Representatives interview groups of students and have the occasion to visit with them personally. Descriptive brochures are placed in the hands of interested students. Why not take this opportunity to confront students with the career of religious life? Why shouldn't our students realize that religious life possesses an eminent stature and is as accessible to candidates as other careers? Furthermore, our youth should realize that works on a supernatural plane pay dividends in this world as well as worldly occupations.

And we might add, we should strive to establish a good working relationship with our public school guidance counselors. They could be of great help in advising us of an individual's academic achievement and aptitude. They are frequently in a position to observe and judge a student in his scholastic, social and emotional attitudes. They, in turn, welcome our interests and insights, and appreciate, above all, our professional approach to a student's total development.

It is necessary that the parish priest be assisted by sisters in this Career Day work. Naturally, a priest is restricted in projecting the image of the sisterhood adequately. Girls in public schools just don't have the acquaintance, very often, with our sisters. The sisters' presence at a Career Day program would be most effective.

In a discussion about the availability of sisters for enjoying contact with parents and children, I once heard the remark, "It is certainly unfair." I thought the person meant unfair to the sisters to be so restricted, but the remark went on: "It is unfair to us, the lay people, to not know and enjoy the associations with sisters at various public functions. It would be grand if young sisters in training could return home on occasion and allow the high school girls really see the happiness and growth of the religious life in girls who, just a few years before, were just like themselves."

One further level that seems to be tremendously fertile ground for yielding vocations is during the college years. The continuous contact with the parish priest is no longer possible. But they come home; and, if the priest is alert, he will be available and see them even during the swing of vacation time. Even at brief moments of reunion it is quite expected that the conversation will turn to their ambitions and current development. Certainly, the priest should not be too aggressive; this would be resented, but we can be somewhat direct in bringing the topic of religious life clearly into the conversations. The college years really present a time for a student's fuller awareness of a social consciousness. Witness for example: the Peace Corps, the Papal Volunteers; interest in social, racial, and economic questions on campuses everywhere.

Public high school graduates who come to the Catholic college campus are frequently thrilled by this new-found opportunity to develop their Catholic culture and enrich their spiritual formation. And while this is going on, they are removed from the parish priest's contact. It would seem worth while to concentrate our interest in them while they are on the campus. Would it

not be worth while to delegate a parish priest to visit the Catholic college campuses where a number of young men and women from the diocese are studying? The approach could present a picture of Catholic life in their own diocese and the need for informed and dedicated laymen. An invitation could be extended to the students to learn something of the talents, fitness, and motivation for religious life. Perhaps personal interviews would allow a student's own thoughts and desires on the religious life to come to life.

Many students are extremely puzzled at the time of high school commencement and need the settling influence of college to clarify their future plans. When this bewilderment begins to disappear, the student could be both intellectually, socially, and spiritually disposed to accept the vocation of religious life. Sometimes it seems we just have to wait until certain boys and girls have given college life a sampling. We should be patient with them, try to stay close to them, make them aware of our interest and above all of our availability.

The parish priest who also serves as a Newman Club chaplain enjoys an opportunity of engaging other mature minds on the subject of the religious life. He can sincerely present the thought and show the honest possibilities for the religious life to the students on the secular campus.

Earlier we spoke of the role of the parish priest in the home. In conclusion, let us return to that thought. We must realistically recognize that parents are the foremost guidance counselors. But we must admit that often when the thought of vocation is exhibited by the child, a whole range of misconceptions are manifested by parents. These reactions could extend from selfishness to glowing pride to utter mystery. Through general means of information (sermons, Sunday bulletins, parish organizations, and so forth) we should be endowing parents with a proper and accurate understanding of the religious life. They need pure motivation and clear understanding just as their children do.

When we realize the interest of a specific individual, we should be alert enough to find ways of visiting with the parents and planting in their hearts an adequate appreciation of their child's interest and desire. Few parents are downright prohibitive, but all, I suppose, are touched by some degree of apprehension. We must dispel their unfounded fears. If the parish priest is available for contact this can be accomplished.

For a more positive view, let us merely refer to the grand opportunities a parish priest enjoys in directing adult apostolic groups. For an example, consider the Christian Family Movement. Here is an opportunity to provide a solid program of Christian formation which opens the minds of good parents to the vocation interest their children are likely to reveal. CFM, like the CCD and the Legion of Mary and many other groups, is a continual study of the valid role of laymen in the Church. What role could be more supreme than to motivate and give their children to the life of religious dedication?

The obvious conclusion to a talk on vocations is the need for prayers. This is indeed essential. St. Paul eloquently declared: "I have planted, my disciple has watered, but it is God who gives the increase."

The words "Come, follow Me" must find an echo in young lives today. Yes, we must pray the Lord of harvest to send laborers into the vineyard, but dare we forget the role we must play. The seeds of vocation have been generously planted. God now, as always, has need of cultivating and water-

ing instruments. Priests, sisters, and good parents must bear witness to this essential and noble task. May we all feel the sentiment of President Kennedy that "on earth, God's work must truly be our own." Let us, then, water and nourish and finally harvest the seeds of vocation as they have grown to maturity in the hearts of our wonderful boys and girls.

The Personality Assessment of Candidates for the Priesthood and the Religious Life

WALTER J. COVILLE, PH.D.

*Chief, Clinical Psychology Services, St. Vincent's Hospital,
New York City, and Consulting Psychologist, St. Joseph's
Seminary and Cathedral College of the Archdiocese of New York,
and the Sisters of Charity of New York*

THE AIM OF MY PAPER is to review in a practical way one approach to the study of the various problems involved in the assessment of candidates for the priesthood and the religious life. By way of introduction, I want to comment on the use of several terms in the context of this paper. The term "religious" or "religious life" is used in a broad sense to include all who are ordained or who take vows to live under a religious rule. This, of course, includes both secular and religious priests, brothers as well as sisters, in all fields of work. It is also noted that personality assessment as developed in this paper deals with the evaluation of physical and psychological factors in order to determine an individual's fitness for the religious life from the natural point of view. Such psychological investigation is not opposed to the supernatural character of a religious vocation but rather it is in accordance with the mind of the Church,¹ which actually directs superiors to utilize the skills of modern specialists in making their judgments concerning the physical and psychological suitability of a candidate for the religious life. Finally, the term "assessment" is meant to include a number of instruments of measurement which, when combined, contribute toward the evaluation or prediction of some complex criterion. In this instance, our proximate criterion is the successful completion of training or formation, culminating in ordination or a profession of vows; whereas our remote criterion is the successful adjustment during the post-ordination or post-profession period. What actually constitutes success in each of these periods, however, is difficult to determine, although it is generally accepted that multiple criteria are involved. Some of these will be discussed later when dealing with the bases

¹ The Apostolic Constitution *Sedes Sapientiae* and the General Statutes of the Sacred Congregation of Religious (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1957) pp. 45-46.

for the various tests used in a typical personality assessment program. Furthermore, I wish to note that my remarks are intended to provide general information to administrators of selection programs in female religious communities as well as in seminaries and male religious communities.

It is emphasized that the basis of an assessment program is the evaluation of a candidate's mental and emotional health about which the psychologist can make predictive judgments with some security and not the identification of specific traits of personality that would make for success in the religious life. The principal aim of an assessment program, therefore, is to assist those who must make the final judgment on the admission of a candidate by identifying those who are mentally and emotionally well suited for the rigorous program of formation, those who have minor weaknesses of character that can be strengthened in time with or without some form of assistance, and finally to identify and to screen out those who are psychologically unsuited.

Religious administrators are concerned with the number of unfit who are unable to cope with the ordinary demands of their vocation, develop deviant adjustments, or suffer mental and emotional collapse. These as well as many others, who are weak and ineffectual in the administration of their duties and responsibilities, tend to distort and lower the image of the priest or religious in the modern world.

Other problems that concern religious administrators include high attrition rates; the high cost of training for so many who eventually drop out (it is estimated, for example, that the cost of educating one seminarian for the priesthood approximates \$20,000); costly treatments for those who suffer psychological breakdowns or require repeated hospitalizations; and finally, the unsuited who can contaminate one individual student or an entire religious population, who monopolize the time of teachers and spiritual directors, and who generally disrupt the efficiency of any training program. In addition, there are many other problems that may arise after ordination or profession. For these reasons, the need for developing new approaches to candidate selection is critical, and religious administrators are encouraged to give the highest priority to the development of appropriate assessment and selection procedures, to study their candidates carefully with regard to moral and intellectual fitness, and to use their authority firmly in removing the unfit from their programs.

In developing an assessment program, several questions present themselves; namely, what methods can be devised to help seminary and religious administrators so that they will be able to eliminate the psychologically unsuited and to identify those who have modifiable problems? Also, what methods can be devised to describe an individual personality in a meaningful way for guidance purposes and to predict this adjustment in a seminary or religious community and later in the priesthood or some form of religious life? The answers to these questions, which also form the basis for the selection of certain tests and procedures of personality evaluation as well as for the development of an adjunctive guidance program, are to some extent contingent upon the nature of the vocation, its duties and responsibilities, and the various demands that are placed upon an individual student during his period of formation and later during his mission as a priest or religious.

Authorities in the field of seminary and religious education generally agree that spirituality, appropriate motivation, adequate intelligence, relative emotional stability, and a capacity for good interhuman relationships comprise

the basic requirements for the religious life. In a sense, they form a kind of job description of the profession of a priest or religious. An evaluation of these characteristics involves subjective interpretations that may vary from one religious administrator to another, depending upon his experiences and upon his own personality make-up. Furthermore, although these characteristics are unpredictable in many areas, they are predictable in many others and, as such, they are appropriate material for study by the behavioral scientist.

The first of these characteristics is *spirituality* and it holds a central place in a religious vocation. The aspirant must be dedicated to the ministry of the Church and must be capable of a natural, personal, and profound involvement with God. He must have a capacity to concentrate primarily upon the core duties of his mission rather than upon its devotional adjuncts; he must do this with an enthusiasm that influences others and with a generosity that enables him to forego his own ambitions. This is a solid and sane spirituality that must be differentiated from emotional pietism and other expressions of a neurotic spirituality often observable in its external manifestations and capable of detection in an interview or certain test responses.

Intimately related to spirituality is the candidate's *motivation* for the religious life. It must reflect not only a deeply rooted piety but also a strong and continuing desire to do God's work. Human motivation is complex and ever changing, and it is impossible to know all the factors involved in the development of a vocation, some of which are truly unconscious. Nevertheless, there are certain guides that help to determine if the candidate's motives are serious, sane, and appropriately inspired. Thus, the decision to enter a religious life must be a calm and deliberate one stemming from a continuing desire to dedicate oneself to the religious way of life. Decisions that are made recently, impulsively, or under emotional stress, such as may be experienced in a depression or in some form of spiritual excitement, must be suspected. It is better to advise such candidates to wait and to test out the genuineness of their decision by time and continued spiritual direction.

Secondly, the desire to become a religious must be evaluated in the light of certain personality characteristics, for what often appears to be a virtue may actually be a neurosis. Thus, for example, I am impressed in my work with a group of candidates who conspicuously reveal themselves as docile, self-effacing, eager to comply, pious and humble, but who actually are passive-dependent personality types. Their apparent virtues are really neurotic reactions to an underlying insecurity characterized by helplessness, indecision, and a need to cling to others for support; they often allay inner anxieties by overeating and develop various degrees of obesity. These are the kinds of candidates who become panicky when they must assume any kind of responsibility or initiate any kind of action; they actually need much emotional support and for this reason engage in sticky and persistent one-sided human relations. It is fairly obvious that motivation for the religious life in the context of this kind of personality may very well represent the candidate's need to escape conflict in the secular world and to seek shelter and support in the religious one. Unfortunately, many of these are also intellectually bright, scholastically successful, and for this reason considered desirable. It is not easy for the religious administrator to dismiss this kind of candidate who traditionally is held in high esteem. Another frequently occurring personality type whose motivation may be complicated by factors of personality is the basically inadequate candidate, who is ambitious beyond his capacity,

needs to find status and recognition, and who may unwittingly exploit others for his own benefit. These usually view religious life in a glamorous fashion and are attracted to it primarily by its external characteristics.

A candidate's spirituality and his motivation for the religious life can be appraised to some extent by test responses that deal with interests, goals, and perspectives as well as by an interview evaluation of certain background factors. It is impossible for me to discuss the analysis of all of these indicators within the limits of this paper but a few observations may be pertinent here. Thus, female aspirants for the religious life are much more open in discussing the spiritual aspects of their motivation than male aspirants, who generally make vague references to altruistic and personal motives. Female candidates also tend to give a history of careful deliberation usually with the help of a sponsor and spiritual director before making a decision and initiating the procedures for admission to the community. Male applicants, on the other hand, usually of comparable age and on a high school senior level in a minor seminary, seem to find themselves at this stage of training without much prior and conscious deliberation about the meaning of their vocation. This seems to become a more critical consideration for them when they graduate from high school, are pursuing studies on a college level, or approach some critical point in their major seminary training. These apparent differences in motivation between male and female aspirants are a function of maturity since college level and older male candidates are found to be more expressive and decisive about their vocational aspirations. A number of inappropriate motivations that warrant attention because they contraindicate suitability for the religious life include: candidates who had several starts in other seminaries or communities and failed; candidates who are intellectually limited and present a history of school failures; candidates who have a history of treatment for a serious mental or emotional disorder; candidates whose decision is recent or the result of an intense or spiritual experience; candidates returning from the armed services and reacting to emotional trauma; candidates who are escaping from intolerable home situations, who are fearful of sex and family responsibilities, or who prefer the companionship of their own sex; and, finally, candidates who just view the religious life as an easy way of life. These predispositions are quite obvious in some instances and make for easy decisions; in other instances they are subtle and may require further observation and follow-up study before a secure judgment can be made concerning the candidate's motivation. This listing of negative features in the motivation of religious candidates is not meant to minimize the fact that there are many who present themselves for the religious life sincerely and with genuine feelings. In fact, contrary to the popular opinion of some behavioral scientists, I am impressed with the overall superior qualifications of so many of the candidates for the religious life.

Authorities in religious education also specify that candidates must possess sufficient basic *intelligence* to achieve academic success in a program of studies appropriate to his eventual placement in the religious life. In most instances, this involves the possession of sufficient intelligence for college or graduate-level studies and for achieving a level of learning that will enable him to function securely in his role as a teacher. It also involves the possession of a practical and prudential intelligence that will enable him to function wisely and effectively in his varied organizational and managerial activities. Every priest and every religious is in a sense an educator with a tremendous influence over the minds and behavior of others. It is important, therefore,

that close attention be given to the candidate's intellectual qualifications. Today, the premium is placed on independent, creative, and responsible thinking in a person who has firm personal values and a capacity to live in accordance with his convictions. A priest, possessing these qualities of mind, therefore, is better equipped to assume his leadership responsibilities than the priest of twenty-five or fifty years ago whose leadership was often rooted in a consistent intellectual conformity that today would be considered weak and not likely to demand respect from followers. This intellectual requirement for leadership really represents a high standard, and its satisfaction is a challenge to our seminaries and houses of religious formation. It implies not only a need for the development of appropriate assessment and selection procedures but also a need for the evaluation of our entire training system.

Emotional stability is another important and basic requirement for the religious life, since emotional factors of personality tend to cut across all of the other requirements and to influence each in a unique way. The priesthood or the religious life really makes extraordinary emotional demands and requires that the individual have strong emotional resources to endure the stresses of the religious life. Thus, the aspirant for the religious life must be mentally healthy and capable of maintaining good control over his feelings and desires. He must also remain idealistic in living his life even in the face of conflict or opposition. It is, perhaps, in this area of investigation that psychological assessment programs make their greatest contribution since the analysis and description of an individual's emotional functioning, as revealed by test and interview findings, impinges upon all of the previously mentioned characteristics of a religious vocation. The tools of measurement and evaluation in this area will be reviewed later.

There are wide personality differences among people and it is not reasonable to suppose that successful candidates for the religious life can be cast into one mold, nor is it the purpose of psychological testing to do so. Although the number of excellent candidates is encouraging, the relatively large number of poor and inadequate candidates is reason for concern. Some of these are obviously poor risks, are easily detected upon examination and should be screened out; others possess weaknesses of character that require further observation and even research, and are classified as borderline applicants; still others have weaknesses that are modifiable in time or require the help of a counselor.

It is not possible in a paper such as this to discuss all personality disorders or the various characteristics of personality and relate these in a predictive fashion to adjustment in the religious life. However, I want to mention some personality types that are poor risks and are not qualified for the religious life as well as some others that are doubtful and otherwise troublesome.

SOME POOR RISKS

The emotionally disturbed that should be screened out on initial examination would generally include the following:

1. The psychotic and pre-psychotic personalities, most of whom are schizophrenic or pre-schizophrenic. These are shut-in or introverted personalities with a basic weakness in interpersonal relationships. They are poor mixers, can't form warm relations with people, actually have no interest in people and prefer to be alone, and whose behavior is highly individualistic, if not

odd. Emotionally, they may be bland, rigid or even inappropriate. Their thinking may be confused or disorganized, and, in the extreme, they may manifest delusions or hallucinations. Although the active schizophrenic is relatively rare as a candidate for the religious life, every religious administrator probably has had an experience with one. Most often, these candidates present a pre-schizophrenic personality that erupts into active symptomatology under the stress of religious life. Some of these initially may appear to be desirable candidates since they are described as models in behavior. Closer scrutiny, however, shows that this model behavior is based on fear and a need to conform, with a predisposition to regress to childish modes of feeling and thinking when placed under emotional stress.

The so-called personality or character disorders would also be considered here, since they represent deep-seated disturbances that provide the individual with little capacity for maneuvering and handling stress except through an escape into a psychosis. The principal disorders considered under this category would include the inadequate, schizoid, cyclothymic, and paranoid personalities.

2. The severe obsessive-compulsive personality is another frequently occurring type that is a poor risk for the religious life. Reference here is not made to the candidate who may have transitory manifestations such as may occur during adolescence, but rather to the candidate who is obsessively preoccupied with morbid content, often of a sexual nature, coupled with a desire to act out impulses. These candidates frequently manifest serious scrupulosity, tend to carry conscientiousness and idealism to an extreme, and are psychosexually retarded. Obsessive-compulsive manifestations, together with homosexual inclinations particularly contraindicate suitability for the religious life.

3. The psychopathic personality, essentially characterized by his non-conforming nature, is another poor risk for the religious life. This behavior may take the form of criminality or delinquency, sexual deviation, alcoholism, or drug addiction. It is noted, too, that these behavioral manifestations may be more than psychopathic or sociopathic, and actually may be revealing an underlying psychotic or even organic disease. Of particular importance in this classification is the homosexual candidate, whose disruptive influence may not only contaminate others in his group but may even reach beyond the religious environment and extend into the secular community. These candidates have deep-set feelings of sexual inadequacy and require prolonged psychological treatments.

By far the greatest number of candidates, however, fall into borderline or doubtful groups that require much more evaluation by research than has been done to date. These would comprise the emotionally unstable, who are prone to panic in an emergency, or are prone to anger, guilt, and anxiety when frustrated; the passive-dependent, who seek emotional support from others; the passive-aggressive, who use passive resistive and subtle obstructionistic maneuvers; the aggressive, who are irritable, have temper tantrums, or otherwise manifest their aggressions by gossip or by bearing grudges; the compulsives, who are hard workers but who are rigid, meticulous, and over-systematic, and whose adherence to and demand for unusually high standards are a source of annoyance to others. Other characteristic problems in the borderline group include various learning, speech, and sleep disturbances,

habit and conduct disturbances, as well as a wide variety of psychosomatic problems.

Finally, a corollary of emotional stability is the religious aspirant's need to be effective and secure in his dealings with people. This *human relations* ability implies that the candidate must be at ease with himself and with others; he must be able to participate socially and to relate sympathetically with all types of people; he must be able to maintain confidences, and, if necessary, must also be able to work in isolation. In addition, he must be capable of maintaining a profound attitude that combines reserve with human warmth and genuine interest in the problems and in the psychology of people. I am impressed here with the number of young men and women who frankly describe themselves as "followers." They fear to make decisions and avoid responsibility. They usually view themselves as inefficient, dependent and inferior to others, and are content to function in the role of a follower. This seems to be consistent with a mentioned observation that too many of our priests and religious feel inferior and are too condescending in their attitude and behavior. This is irritating to laity and others who expect them to assume leadership roles in this changing world. The recurrence of these various personality types points up the great need that exists to provide candidates for the religious life with maturing insights and experiences.

THE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

At this point, I want to comment in a general way about organizing an assessment program. Thus, the selection of a program director requires careful consideration. Most assessment programs utilize a psychologist as the principal examiner, with a psychiatrist used as a consultant in the case of doubtful or otherwise disturbed candidates, although there are several programs that are essentially administered by a psychiatrist. Furthermore, there are probably as many assessment programs as there are examiners, each developing a program best suited to his own interests and areas of competence. All, however, attempt to appraise the candidate from the standpoint of intelligence, motivation, emotional and physical functioning.

The assessment program must be administered by a fully competent professional and several courses in psychology do not qualify one for this work. The director must be not only competent in the use and interpretation of various psychological tools but must also be well informed about and sensitive to the various unique aspects of training and living in a religious community. Obviously, there is a distinct advantage if the examiner himself is a religious or has experienced the religious life, but this is not considered a requisite for an effective program. The key qualification here seems to be the professional competence of the examiner rather than his religious status or orientation. However, there is a point of practical interest to be considered when the priest or religious examiner lives or is in frequent communication with those whom he has examined psychologically. Some feel that his presence in the community would interfere with the candidate's secure adjustment since he would know that the raw data of his examination is always accessible for study. On the other hand, an examination by a lay psychologist constitutes a more objective relationship and further ensures the confidentiality of the candidate's examination.

Furthermore, the successful introduction of an assessment program requires

careful planning as well as the complete support of the religious administrator. It is estimated that at least one year is necessary to plan the program and to orient others to it. This planning may include a trial administration of all tests to a sampling of students currently in the seminary or religious community, the development of tentative local norms for the intelligence test, a tentative appraisal of other tests and procedures to determine their suitability for a particular group, and a program of orientation for the faculty. The latter may involve a series of conferences to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of an assessment program, the various tests to be used and their function, the problems that may be anticipated when the program is under way, and most of all for gaining faculty support in the administration of a follow-up guidance program. This is most important, since the assessment program would be incomplete without it and psychological appraisals, for the most part, would be filed away and forgotten. A final advantage of these conferences with the faculty is the teacher's involvement in the program's guidance and research activities, although he may have some reservations about it or may even oppose it.

The orientation of candidates to testing procedures also constitutes an important part of the examination. It is generally helpful to have a religious administrator introduce the examiner, discuss briefly the purpose of the examination, and encourage the candidates to cooperate with established procedures. The psychologist in his own introduction indicates that the test battery is designed to evaluate certain aptitudes and factors of personality considered basic to a good adjustment in religious life and that the candidate will have an opportunity to discuss certain items of this examination in an interview with the examiner. The candidate is told that the raw data of his tests remain in the examiner's possession and do not become a part of his confidential file in religious life; only a summary report, interpreting but not listing test and interview findings, will be transmitted to the seminary or community as a confidential document. Furthermore, the candidate is told that he does not receive a copy of this report and is also reassured that the psychologist does not make decisions concerning his admission to religious life, but that this is solely the decision of the religious administrator. To further safeguard confidentiality, it is recommended that a code system as well as a special file be established for the identification and safe keeping of all test papers and reports. Candidates are also informed at this time that no reports will be transmitted now, or at any time in the future, to any person or agency without prior authorization by the candidate, his parent, or his guardian. Accordingly, permissions for the examination and the interview are signed by those candidates who are twenty-one or more years of age; those under twenty-one years of age are asked to return these permissions to the examiner after having obtained the signature of a parent or guardian.

Testing and interviewing completed, all data are analyzed and interpreted in a summary report prepared for transmittal to the rector or religious superior. The report is organized to present in a practical fashion a dynamic description of the personality, suitable not only as an aid to the religious administrator for his further evaluation and decision concerning the candidate's suitability, but also as a report identifying facts of personality that may require help through guidance or counseling. The report includes a description of the candidate's appearance and other features of observable behavior, his level of intellectual functioning with a prediction concerning scholastic achievement, and a practical and dynamic appraisal of the per-

sonality, highlighting motivational and other factors of personality pertinent to the vocation. Based on these data, a recommendation is then made placing the candidate in one of several categories, namely "recommended unconditionally," "recommended with guidance or counseling," "doubtful-recommended," "doubtful-retest," "doubtful-not recommended," and finally "not recommended."

It is noted that the report of the psychological examination is merely a *recommendation* with regard to the candidate's psychological suitability for the profession of the priesthood or the religious life. The final judgment and decision concerning the applicant's overall suitability is made by the religious superior who views the applicant and his vocation from many points of view. It is important to keep in mind that although psychological findings are valuable, they are only one criterion of suitability and that no test can predict absolutely concerning human beings. Of course, the best assurance of reliability and validity in the administration of a selection program lies not merely in the competent use of appropriate tools but also and, perhaps more critically, in the mature judgment of an experienced examiner.

As stated previously, the characteristics of spirituality, motivation, intelligence, emotional stability, and a capacity for good human relations form a kind of job description of the religious life and are the bases for the selection of certain tests and procedures of personality evaluation. I now want to describe some of these procedures as used in the New York assessment program.

THE NEW YORK ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

The intelligence test used in the New York test battery is the College Qualification Test. This test provides a total CQT score which compares the candidate with the religious community's normative population in terms of percentile rank and also enables us to study the candidate's differential abilities. My experience with this test essentially confirms the observation of others that the typical test profile will show a superiority of verbal over numerical functioning and, in terms of information, a superiority of learning in the social studies over learning in the sciences. This essentially means that candidates for the religious life are better developed verbally, have good language skills, like to read and prefer academic subjects, and also tend to learn more effectively in the social studies areas than in the sciences. Severe deviations from the common profile are considered suspect and usually are found to be related to some disturbance in emotional functioning.

Intellectual fitness constitutes a prerequisite for admission to a seminary or religious community, and intelligence testing is indispensable in any assessment program. It is noted, of course, that standards of intellectual competency will vary from one religious institution to another in accordance with the demands of each, or within one community in accordance with the demands of a specific job placement. For this reason, it is necessary to develop local intelligence test norms and to determine minimum requirements for each level of functioning. These then become a basis for certain policy decisions, made to ensure the maintenance of appropriate standards. Such policy decisions tend to simplify and objectify admission procedures and provide a firm guide for the selection of future candidates. This, in turn, tends to lower attrition rates. Research findings also show that intelligence test scores combined with an evaluation of past academic work form one of the

best bases for predicting academic success. If, in addition, we consider the fact that academic success is also a function of good motivation and freedom from disabling emotional stress, then a selection procedure based upon the evaluation of past academic work and current intelligence test performance would identify not only those who lack basic intellectual endowment but also those who have good capacity but who are underachieving severely because of impinging emotional stresses. In either case, their serious deficiency in intellectual functioning would contraindicate serious consideration for admission into the religious life.

The examination also concerns the evaluation of personality from the standpoint of emotional functioning. Testing in this area also touches upon the candidate's motivations for the religious life. The personality tests used in our battery include the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality, the Sentence Completion Test, the Draw-A-Person test, and the Personality Inventory for Religious. These are also supplemented by the administration of a Life History Questionnaire and a Clinical Interview.

The MMPI is probably the most widely used structured personality test of the questionnaire type and as such taps the person's conscious evaluation of himself. This test yields a multi-dimensional description of the personality, expressed in terms of nine clinical scales which indicate trends toward patterns of behavior that in the extreme suggest serious pathology. This is a valuable test that provides insight into the individual personality, provided that the testee answers questions frankly and honestly. Most candidates for the religious life do so. Because of the popularity of this test and also because of the amount of research done with it in the study of seminary and religious populations, several serious misconceptions have developed around it. Thus, there are some who view the MMPI as the sole criterion of normality and, therefore, of suitability for the religious life. This is probably due to the publicity given to this test in the many studies dealing with the religious. However, the use of the MMPI alone as a screening device is dangerous since no single test can provide confident predictions with regard to any aspect of behavior. A test such as the MMPI becomes important in candidate assessment only insofar as it contributes additional information about a candidate to be considered together with other dimensions of the individual's personality. I often find normal MMPI profiles in candidates who are otherwise disturbed emotionally, but whose control at the time of examination is good and whose honest responses yield no clue to an underlying disorder. However, when this control over conflictual material becomes ineffective and the pain of symptoms prompts a referral for further evaluation, a repetition of the MMPI yields a markedly deviant profile. On the other hand, an abnormal MMPI profile on initial examination suggests the presence of an underlying disorder and demands further investigation.

A test that is not apt to be so easily manipulated by a testee, especially if he is prone to falsify responses, is the Sentence Completion Test. This is a semi-structured projective test of personality, consisting of incomplete sentences which the subject is asked to complete. This test allows the individual to express his thoughts or feelings with a minimum of threat or exposure, and also allows him to respond in a manner consistent with the structure of his whole personality. This is one of the more valid tests of personality that provides valuable insights into several areas of adjustment. The test used in the New York assessment program is a Sentence Completion Test

developed by Mother Elaine Sandra, M.C.S.A.,² in her doctoral study of religious personality types. The areas of adjustment sampled by this test include: attitudes toward parents and the family unit, attitudes toward early life, feelings and attitudes toward self, goals and time perspectives, reactions to failure and frustration, attitudes toward people in authority, fears and worries, attitudes toward people in general, reaction of others to self, and, finally, feelings of security. Needless to say these represent significant areas of adjustment and a serious disturbance in any one of these could result in an adjustment problem.

Another interesting and, in my opinion, important test of personality is the Draw-A-Person Test. This projective test of personality, based upon the interpretation of an individual's drawing of human figures, helps to evaluate the unconscious determinants of self-expression. Thus, the subject in drawing human figures, consciously as well as unconsciously, draws upon his whole system of psychic values, and in his perception of the body image may reflect his own body needs and conflicts. This test, however, is not to be used by amateurs, and its reliability of interpretation is directly related to the experience of the interpreting psychologist.

The Life History Questionnaire, developed specifically for the selection of candidates for the religious life, consists of a wide range of items, covering mainly personal history, educational interests and achievements, social relationships, aspirational and motivational factors, health history, and self appraisal. This questionnaire, together with certain responses, identified as "Stop Items" in the Personal Inventory for Religious, provides clues for further evaluation during the clinical interviews.

The Personal Inventory for Religious is a self-reporting type of instrument, also developed especially for use with seminarians and religious populations. It consists of 300 items gathered from a study of interview records and psychotherapy sessions of various religious. This test is being used experimentally but efforts are now being made to analyze and standardize it for use with religious populations.

Finally, the clinical interview completes the battery of diagnostic procedures and represents the most important tool of evaluation in the assessment program. All of our candidates are interviewed, usually one week after test administration. The interviews average about thirty minutes per candidate, some, however, extending up to one hour. Usually the older the candidate the longer the interview, since there is more history to evaluate and to relate to the vocational decision. The interview provides the examiner with an opportunity to meet the candidate face to face, observe his behavior as well as other features of appearance, voice, or mannerisms in a normal stress situation, and to investigate further items of importance as indicated in the candidate's questionnaire or Personal Inventory. The evaluation of interview and test data then contribute toward making a predictive judgment about the candidate's suitability.

A critical appraisal of an operating assessment program yields a number of interesting observations. First, the introduction of an assessment program organizes selection procedures and gives status to admission policy. This

² Mother M. Elaine Sandra, M.C.S.A., "Degree of Adherence to the Catholic Religion as Related to Selected Personality Indices" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1957).

is essentially due to the program's unbiased evaluations which aids the religious administrator through the selections and admissions committee in making decisions concerning the candidate's suitability. These unbiased evaluations supplement the observations of the religious administrator and his committee, since the psychologist elicits and interprets facts that an untrained observer would miss because he is not aware of the psychopathology that may be indicated by what the candidate says or does, or because the candidate may be consciously defending himself. Thus, the psychologist's report is helpful in confirming the administrator's judgment and in helping him to make a more objective and secure decision, in identifying the misfit for screening out, in revealing excellences that otherwise might remain hidden, and in proposing to upgrade the caliber of candidates and thereby increase individual and community productivity. Furthermore, such assessment procedures tend to give the candidate, as well as the religious community, a greater security with regard to the vocational decision, since both realize that if the candidate were unsuited or otherwise did not have a vocation, he would have been screened out. In addition, the program provides profiles of successful candidates as well as of dropouts, which in time serve as a guide for the screening of other candidates in the future.

The personality assessment program also initiates a system of record keeping, organized to provide discretionary use of the psychological report for guidance purposes without sacrificing confidentiality. It creates a greater awareness of the practical needs involved in the performance of various duties and promotes research to establish norms for various levels of work. If successfully pursued, such normative studies would result in a standardization of position and so-called job requirements, as well as in efficient program administration.

Another interesting but not an unexpected observation is that the existence of an assessment program in itself becomes a variable of selection so that candidates who are undesirable because of obvious personality problems, or who do not have sufficient capacity for college level work, eliminate themselves. A natural corollary of this is that candidate groups become more desirable from these standpoints. This is already noted in the administration of an assessment program for a community of religious women where a higher percentage of acceptable candidates are beginning to apply. This is encouraging for recruitment purposes and tends to support the observation that a mature and stable group will tend to attract individuals who themselves are mature and stable. Thus, the establishment of an assessment program, in addition to the already noted advantages, becomes a genuine recruitment factor with more potential for attracting good candidates than any advertising gimmick.

Though advantages far outweigh disadvantages, there are several problems worth noting. One of these concerns the time that elapses between testing and the administrator's disposition of the candidate's application. An average delay of one month, sometimes extended because of the need for individual testing in doubtful instances or for additional examinations due to some unusual physical condition, tends to generate anxiety in the candidate, his family, and often his religious sponsors or directors. This, on occasion, leads to a public relations problem, especially when a sponsor or spiritual adviser learns that his or her candidate is not as well suited as initially thought. The resolution of these problems, however, takes time, and education in the pur-

pose and advantage of an assessment program is necessary to ensure eventual cooperation.

Finally, I wish to note the need for certain adjunctive programs. Thus, in my judgment, no assessment program should be planned without an appropriate guidance program and a follow-up research program. Although one important aim is to screen out misfits and those who are otherwise not qualified for the religious life, the more important purpose, it seems to me, is to identify the individual's strengths and weaknesses of personality and to offer recommendations toward a fuller development of that person. The basic responsibility, after all, of the rector or superior, the classroom teacher, the guidance counselor or spiritual director is the development of the individual student so that he may function effectively in his role as an ordained priest or professed religious. This implies a knowledge of the candidate's limitations and potential capacities, with the intention of developing these potentials within the limits imposed by his basic capacity and other environmental factors. This responsibility for student development demands an active program—a program that in an integrated fashion will relate all known factors about the student to his life goals so that he may grow in emotional maturity and security and eventually assume his role in the adult world.

Ideally, there should also be an in-service training program for certain interested members of the faculty. This in-service program would seem to be especially important for those who have responsibility for developing individual personalities more intimately, such as the novice master (or mistress) or spiritual director. Such a program is designed to develop and sharpen one's capacity for establishing meaningful relationships with students, to develop a certain level of competence in personal counseling, to recognize those whose problems of adjustment are more serious and beyond one's competence, and to refer these appropriately for psychotherapy.

Research is also an essential adjunct of an assessment program. The New York program,⁸ now in its fourth year of operation and having processed over six hundred candidates that comprise the research population, is designed to include not only the standardization of its instruments of evaluation but also to follow up this population through its years of training and possibly beyond. The latter includes an analysis of several criterion groups such as dropouts, referrants for counseling or psychotherapy, academic underachievers, candidates from non-seminary high schools and colleges, and candidates with special problems or unique background features.

Thus, the development and administration of a personality assessment program represents a modern scientific approach to the study of the candidate for the priesthood or the religious life. It aims to evaluate the basic requirements for the religious life which include spirituality, appropriate motivation, adequate intelligence, relative emotional stability, and a capacity for good interhuman relationships; it aims to supplement and not to supplant traditional procedures of evaluation and selection; and it also aims to upgrade the caliber of young men and women who want to dedicate themselves to God's work so that eventually they will be able to pursue their various works with excellence and with the greatest security. The effectiveness with which this is achieved depends upon the material that religious administrators

⁸ W. J. Coville, *Research Plans in the Fields of Religion, Values, and Morality, and Their Bearing on Religious Character Formation*, ed. Stuart W. Cook (New York: Religious Education Association, 1962), pp. 175-88.

have to work with. The development of individual personalities during their periods of training is an awesome responsibility that eventually in some way impinges upon the lives of many thousands of people. Though primarily centered in the religious administrator, this responsibility should be shared by all who participate in the preparation of an individual personality for the greatest job on earth—a job that demands excellence in the application of knowledge and spirit in all areas of human endeavor; a profession that carries a power and dignity that is beyond any other because it is derived from the power and dignity of Christ Himself and because it aims to assist others in finding their peace and salvation in God's Will. Thus, the call to the priesthood, brotherhood or sisterhood is indeed a supreme privileged one to which "many are called but few are chosen," and paraphrasing one of St. Paul's admonitions, let me say: "Test all candidates; hold fast to those who are good."

The Sister in the Modern World

(Summary)

SISTER MAUREEN O'KEEFE, S.S.N.D.

Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

YOUNG WOMEN are not attracted to religious life as they ought to be or as we wish them to be. Besides this, many women leave religious communities each year during the formation period or even after they have made their vows. Why is this? And what can religious superiors do to attract, to develop to their fullest capacity, and to hold more of the modern, competent young women who have so much to give to the world in general and to their apostolate in particular?

The problem of religious vocations is of perennial concern to members of religious communities. It has two major aspects; namely, the women who are potential recruits to religious life, and the women who have already committed themselves to consecrated service of God in religious life. It is essential that consideration be given, first, to the personal qualities and vocational expectations of worthy young women of today who could be, and are, prospective religious of tomorrow.

Young women of today have learned the importance of status, ambition, and efficiency in modern society. They are challenged by competition. Rightly motivated, they are ready to do long-range planning, to make decisions, and to take the consequences for them. These young women are interested in self-improvement and are honest enough to accept suggestions in that direction. They seek the genuine and the real in life. They have formed habits of intelligent independence. In entering a convent, they expect to find an enlightened and substantial means of developing into true Christians—real, truly fulfilled women—privileged to give of themselves and their talents in a meaningful and consecrated service of God. Young women can be taught to channel these traits to excellent advantage in religious life.

It is also necessary to consider: Who is the sister in the modern world? What are the dimensions of her apostolate in contemporary society?

The sister in the modern world must be a real person. All sham or pretense must be eliminated. She must really be what she seems to be and what she is supposed to be—an apostle of love. But she must also be completely sophisticated, a truly cultured, gracious woman. There must be preparedness—spiritually, psychologically, professionally. The day is gone, fortunately, when a religious woman will be accepted just because she “is one of the good sisters.” She must actually be capable of excellent performance in her field. This puts a responsibility on religious superiors.

If the sister superior in the modern world has a genuine concern for the Christian family, she will be more open-minded in recruiting vocations to religious life. Too often, she tends to limit her vocational efforts to her own vested interests—her religious community—and often to the detriment of the aspirant in particular and the apostolate in general. For instance, if a student who is interested in nursing wants to be a religious and seeks advice from a sister in a community devoted exclusively to teaching, the sister, if she is honest and primarily interested in the welfare of the apostolate, will inform the student truthfully of the type of nursing done in the community and suggest that she join a community where hospital nursing is done.

The sister in the modern world is every religious woman in every convent across the nation. Opportunity is at her door. The vocation problem, as well as all other conventual concerns of the modern apostolate, can be influenced significantly by each religious woman who vitally lives the love of Christ that she has vowed. Through the enlightenment afforded her in this love-relationship with Christ, she assumes a positive approach in fulfilling her Christian commitment: to love God above all and her neighbor as herself. This love makes her religious life authentic and meaningful. The enlightened sister develops a rational, productive relevance to her surroundings and becomes part of it as a leaven of God's love. Further, she is enthusiastic, truly zealous, in giving a whole-hearted service to others. Habitual joy characterizes the sister who is apostolically enthusiastic about the religious life. The sister in the modern world strives for excellence in the service she gives. She endeavors to become a real person, and actually be capable of excellent performance in her field of activity.

The spirit of enterprise is the courage and readiness for sacrifice—a dynamic mixture of faith and love giving the energy necessary to work for the needs of the apostolate. Possessed of this spirit of apostolic giving, the religious woman habitually asks herself, “What can I give?” rather than “What will I get?” in her approach to life. Christian esprit de corps enables a sister to translate “bear one another's burdens” into practical terms. Besides, the sister in the modern world needs a generous amount of balance. This equanimity presupposes a set of values which is substantial and for which she is willing to organize her life in order to maintain a rational perspective. She is able, therefore, to keep her life and its activities in focus with God, her final aim.

The sister in the modern world sees the development of these qualities as her personal responsibility and realizes what tremendous powers she has to influence the world—by *being* a real apostle—the strong but tender woman of God; and by relating to the apostolate so effectively that the world is better because she is here.

The Mission of the Theresians

MRS. CHARLES H. LOVETTE

Theresian Director, State of Indiana; Fort Wayne, Indiana

THIS AFTERNOON, I am going to tell you a story about a wonderful vocation apostolate—the Theresians. I'm going to talk about what we are, what we're doing, and where we hope to go. But first, I want you to know that I am delighted to be here, and for a very commonsense reason. You, the religious, are the people we want to know; indeed, you are the people we need to know if this great work is to achieve the purpose of its existence.

Our organization is of recent origin and the Theresian member is new to this vocation apostolate. We need to know so many answers. We need to learn what makes a vocation and what inspires it to develop. You can give us these answers, and we will be coming to you for these answers.

With the help of the Holy Spirit, I hope my word picture of the Theresians "comes alive," so that each of you will become a messenger of the Theresians, and help us introduce to your parishes, high schools, and colleges, and to your towns and cities, this rather new vocation program of our Church.

First, I'd like to tell you how I feel about being a Theresian. Never have I experienced such a tremendous sense of personal satisfaction. It has opened up a whole new dimension of the Faith and brought God closer and made the Church dearer to me. First, I will explain our structure. We are an organization of Catholic adult lay women, college girls, and high school girls, whose purpose is to foster vocations to the more than six hundred mother-houses of religious women in this country. Our aim, either as individuals or in groups, is to create a climate in our homes and communities, where sisterhood vocations can grow and flourish. Our patroness is the Little Flower. Our motto is, "Without God, we cannot. Without us, God will not." Our prayer is:

Blessed Saint Therese, great lover of souls, guide all our efforts to foster vocations to the sisterhood and inspire within us true zeal for this cause. Help us to foster within our homes and communities, an atmosphere in which religious vocations can grow; where young women will learn to be generous to their Blessed Lord. Heavenly Patroness, help us to be the doorstep over which many will pass on their way to God's service. And if, in being loyal Theresians, we become tired through our endeavors, remind us that we have become a stone on the highway to the sisterhood by helping the Church in her hour of need.

We have ten principles, and all who share in this lay apostolic work use these as daily guidelines:

1. We consider prayer to be the first and most effective means of increasing sisterhood vocations.
2. We believe that a conscientious study of the vocation of religious women is necessary in order to understand it and explain it to others.

3. We ask God to send each religious community an annual increase of total membership in order to meet the needs of the Church.
4. We work in harmony with existing vocation programs.
5. We judge what we do as an individual is as important as group activity.
6. We pray and work for vocations to all religious communities.
7. We strive to create a spiritual atmosphere in our homes where sisterhood vocations can develop.
8. We inspire a zeal for this lay apostolic work in our citizens so that vocations will flourish.
9. We make suggestions to a religious in regard to the vocation apostolate only if requested.
10. We are authorized by the Ordinary of each ecclesiastical jurisdiction where we exist.

The Theresians were founded in Pueblo, Colorado, on October 3—the Little Flower's Feast Day—in 1961, by the Very Reverend Monsignor Elwood C. Voss, who is our national director. Our Episcopal adviser is the Most Reverend Charles A. Buswell, bishop of the Pueblo Diocese. Seven lay women are members of an executive board which determines national policy. An advisory board of twenty-five members includes outstanding priests, sisters, and laywomen from various sections of the United States. Area directors are laywomen who are responsible for the establishment and supervision of all units within the territory assigned to them. A priest serves as chaplain to the adult groups. A sister is moderator of the college and high school groups.

The Theresian officials I have just named hope to make this the best organization of Catholic laywomen in America. Their motive is not one of pride. The Theresians are not an end in themselves but only a means to a greater end—to develop an awareness or a vocation spirit in this country.

We are not social. We stress prayer, study, and work, and this is what really appeals to the Catholic woman and girl. We have one objective and one objective only: fostering vocations to the sisterhoods. To accomplish this we use four tools: prayer, education, teaching, and work.

1. *Prayer.* Each member promises to make a weekly Holy Hour in a church or chapel for this vocation intention. Each member is automatically enrolled in the Prayer Crusade for Sisterhood Vocations and promises to pray daily for a designated religious community.

Each meeting begins with the recitation of the rosary and ends with the Theresian prayer.

There are various spiritual activities—Vocation Masses, Holy Hours, Days of Recollection, Retreats.

Some of the groups have assigned the membership to daily Masses, so that the Theresian prayer—for an increase in vocations—is offered up at the Sacrifice of the Mass by at least one Theresian woman in each unit every day of the year.

And there is the Prayer of the Sick. Many units have made this a permanent project and a committee calls on hospitals, rest homes, and visits shut-ins.

The Prayer Crusade for Sisterhood Vocations was started by Monsignor Voss in 1950, and has a membership of over 100,000 in the fifty states. When the Theresians were founded in 1961, they took over the sponsorship. All religious communities belong and share in the graces merited by

the membership. These religious communities and laywomen affiliate directly with the National Office.

2. *Education.* We literally "go back to school" at each monthly meeting. Our teachers are you, the religious, the priests and the lay experts. We learn about the life of the religious and the teachings of the Church in regard to vocations. These educational sessions are the greater part of each meeting and much time and thought is spent on programming, assuring the membership of vital, alive talks covering all the areas in which we need more knowledge—and these areas are endless.

3. *Teaching.* After we have listened to and learned from these speakers, we impart this knowledge to others—to our families and friends. The Theresian membership is urged to spend time in spiritual reading and to become familiar with the many books dealing with the emerging layman. One of these is *The Modern Apostle*, by Father Putz.

4. *Work.* I mention this last because we know that without the praying, the studying, and the communication or teaching, our work would not bear fruit. The work area embraces activities at parish level—Mother-Daughter Communion Breakfasts with the sisters as guests to mingle and talk; panel discussions with parents, again involving the sisters as well as the clergy; possibly a tea talk on a Sunday afternoon, again with the sisters as guests.

And there are tours and workshops at nearby motherhouses, where the Theresian member may observe the religious on their home ground, so to speak, and where they can follow for a day in the footsteps of a novice or postulant, and have brought home to them, beautifully and graphically, the joys of this calling. The thinking of the Theresian member is permeated with an intense desire to know the religious better and an intense desire to involve the religious more. And within the framework of your vows, we hope to involve you whenever we can, and go to you for help, ideas, and inspiration at every opportunity.

We know that we shall gain immeasurably by this closer association. But so will all of you. We can go places you can't go and talk with people you may never meet—and when we are in contact with our Catholic and non-Catholic friends, we will show a standard of personal love and respect for the sisters that will upgrade regard for the sisterhoods everywhere.

The future of this closer association looks bright indeed. It is a productive and a rewarding one in the western states. From my personal experience as director of Indiana, the response of the motherhouses that have teaching sisters in the states is heart warming. The mothers general have opened their doors for tours, workshops and panels. In my diocese, Fort Wayne-South Bend, their welcome mats are warm. Other dioceses that are interested and waiting to help are Gary and Lafayette.

We know the things we must do: what we need are the answers. We know we must give to girls and young women a proper concept of the life of a religious, of the joys of this calling, so that they will have a responsive heart to God's call, when and if it comes.

We must give parents a true and clear picture of this life, too, so their hearts are in tune and they will, with no hesitation, encourage their child to embrace this vocation. We want to know the answers to: "Why is it a parent's duty to 'make ready' these daughters—and how to go about the doing of it?" We want to know what the spiritual rewards are so we can fight the worldly

values. We must make our Catholic homes a fertile place for vocations to grow because fostering a vocation really begins at home and must be cultivated at home. We know a religious calling must be as much a part of family conversation as a worldly vocation so that it is not a thing set apart in the mind of a child.

We know that God's voice is heard most often in homes where the daily rosary is recited, where vocation prayers are said, where the sacraments are often received, where children go to Mass during the summer months and not only during the school term. We know a Catholic home should be the primary house of religious formation—but that many Catholic homes will never be this unless this vocation gospel is spread.

In all these many things, we need the right answer at the right time.

As Thesians, we know the favorable impact of our Christian interest in various organizations of Catholic Action and civic undertakings. We are not observers or spectators. We are active participants. In all respect to our spiritual mission, we are public relations for the Church and for vocations. We are communicating ideas and prayers for the purpose of developing knowledge which in turn leads to understanding which in turn leads to active support.

Imagine the still greater coverage when the College and Junior Thesians programs, geared to meet the needs of those attending school, hit their spiritual stride. About a year and a half ago the Junior Thesians got under way in the western states, and these ninth to twelfth graders astounded us with their zeal and their dedication. They must be trained for the day they will be adult leaders and carry on this work with their bishops and the sisterhoods in another generation.

Bridging the age gap between the adult Thesian and the high school girl is the College program. The College constitution came off the press about six months ago and has been enthusiastically received. The zeal and dedication is here, too, and the National Office believes that this will be the training ground for our future adult leaders.

The High School and College Thesians work directly with the state director, and this is good. The progress of these two groups shows that the young girl and woman, given a spiritual job to do, will do it and do it well. The High School and College Thesians use basically the same constitution as the adult Thesians, with minimum variations to conform to their age.

To sum up: We are an organization of Catholic laywomen, college girls, and high school girls, filled with zeal for this cause. We have one objective and one objective only, fostering vocations to the sisterhoods.

We enjoy almost 100 percent blessings from the bishops and the mothers general so far contacted.

We have reached national proportions in purpose and scope of activity and interest has been shown in foreign countries so we may soon be international. We are youthful, both in organizational years and in membership age.

We are hopeful that the Thesians framework of prayer, study, and work will become a showcase for the religious life. It is *this* life, and *this* life *alone*, in which we are interested.

This is the Thesian mission. This is what we are, what we are doing and where we are hoping to go. Please remember us in your prayers, that our foundation may be spiritually sound and that every vocation brick we lay may be an added blessing from our Lord.

One last word. Bishop Sheen has said that there are millions of vocations hanging from the heavens by golden threads and all it takes to free them and let them float down to earth are our prayers.

• *PROCEEDINGS AND REPORTS*

Vocation Section: Officers 1964-65

Chairman: Rev. William J. Martin, Toledo, Ohio

Vice Chairman: Rev. Francis A. McKay, M.M., Maryknoll, New York

Secretary: Brother Eymard Salzman, C.S.C., Notre Dame, Indiana

Advisory Board

Very Rev. Msgr. Vincent J. Howard, Detroit, Michigan

Rev. Raymond Dolan, O. Carm., New York, N.Y.

Brother Donald, O.F.M., Brooklyn, New York

Sister M. Patricia, R.S.M., Omaha, Nebraska

Sister M. Innocence, O.S.F., Milwaukee, Wisconsin

APPENDIX I

Financial Report of the National Catholic Educational Association, 1963

Washington, D.C., December 31, 1963

GENERAL ACCOUNT

RECEIPTS

1963

Jan. 1 Balance on hand \$ 72,899.47

1963 Receipts:

Membership Dues:

Sustaining members\$ 1,225.00

Major Seminary Department 2,775.00

Minor Seminary Department 3,350.00

College and University Department 21,000.00

School Superintendents Department 2,700.00

Secondary School Department 21,596.00

Elementary School Department 89,115.00

Special Education Department 1,351.00

Supervisors Section 4,169.00

Vocation Section 498.00

Newman Section (Individual) 83.00

General members 6,321.00

Total membership fees \$154,183.00

Convention Receipts 60,000.00

Donations 14,570.00

Income on Reserve Fund 6,381.26

Reports and Bulletins 9,843.85

Subscriptions to the *Bulletin* 734.48

Royalties 287.44

Miscellaneous receipts 5.73

Total receipts during 1963 246,005.76

Total, January 1, 1963 balance, plus 1963 receipts \$318,905.23

EXPENDITURES

Operating Expenses of the National Office:

Salaries		\$100,616.11
Printing:		
NCEA Quarterly <i>Bulletin</i> :		
November 1962	\$ 1,967.60	
February 1963	2,650.33	
May 1963	1,977.80	
August 1963 (Proceedings)	21,691.66	\$28,287.39
<i>Accounting Manual for Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools</i>	4,879.25	
<i>Calendar of Meetings, 1963-64</i>	901.40	
Pamphlets, stationery, office forms, etc.	5,929.82	
Total Printing		39,997.86
Mimeographing and duplicating		5,189.93
Postage		7,622.11
Rent		17,456.50
Operating expenses of Staff House		2,836.57
Telephone and telegraph		2,958.20
Office supplies		3,276.75
Office equipment		3,663.48
Repair and upkeep of office equipment		694.03
Insurance		1,491.25
Books, magazines, etc.		848.55
Audit of accounts		250.00
Petty cash fund		71.17
D.C. Personal Property Tax		472.78
Miscellaneous office expense		1,105.85
Total operating expenses of National Office		\$188,551.14
Membership in professional organizations		635.00
Contributions to other professional associations		850.00
Expense Accounts: Executive Secretary, Associate Secretaries, and professional staff on assignment		19,723.76

EXPENDITURES—Continued

Departmental Expenses during 1963: (Departmental printed publications and field expenses only)

Seminary Departments—

Regional Meeting, Chicago	\$ 784.55	
Special Committee on Latin	—10.00	\$ 774.55

College and University Department—

<i>Newsletter</i>	2,400.00	
Regional Unit expenses	475.00	
Secretary's Office	1,700.00	4,575.00

School Superintendents Department—

October Meeting of the Department	1,682.52	
Public Education Project	1,148.60	
Supervisors Section	111.03	2,942.15

Secondary School Department—

<i>Catholic High School Quarterly Bulletin</i> ...	2,865.94	
<i>Pointers for Principals</i>	1,265.48	
Philosophy of a Catholic Secondary School	30.00	
Regional Unit expenses	607.28	
Articulation Committee Meeting	1,006.26	5,774.96

Elementary School Department—

<i>Catholic Elementary Education News</i>	2,276.22	
Articulation Committee Meeting	1,006.23	3,282.45

Total Departmental Expenses \$ 17,349.11

Committee Expenses:

General Executive Board	\$9,025.37	
Problems and Plans Committee	1,824.19	

Total Committee Expenses 10,849.56

Legal and other professional counsel 500.00

Gabriel Richard Lecture 500.00

Sister Formation Project 2,400.00

Adult Education Commission 700.00

Total expenditures during 1963 \$242,058.57

Balance on hand, December 31, 1963 76,846.66*

Total: 1963 Expenditures plus Balance
on hand, December 31, 1963 \$318,905.23

*Of this \$76,846.66, \$7,000.00 was temporarily on loan to the Washington Office of the Carnegie Study of Catholic Education at the end of the calendar year. This \$7,000 was repaid by the Study and redeposited in the General Account in January, 1964.

APPENDIX II

Constitution and Bylaws of the National Catholic Educational Association

ARTICLE I. NAME

SECTION 1. The name of this Association shall be the National Catholic Educational Association of the United States.

ARTICLE II. OBJECTS

SECTION 1. It shall be the object of this Association to strengthen the conviction of its members and of people generally that the proper and immediate end of Christian education is to cooperate with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian.

SECTION 2. In addition this Association shall emphasize that Christian education embraces the whole aggregate of human life, physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic and social, with the goal of elevating it and perfecting it according to the example and teaching of Christ.

SECTION 3. To accomplish these goals the Association shall encourage a spirit of mutual helpfulness among Catholic educators by the promotion of the study, discussion, and publication of matters that pertain to religious instruction and training as well as to the entire program of the arts and sciences. The Association shall emphasize that the true Christian does not renounce the activities of this life but develops and perfects his natural faculties by coordinating them with the supernatural.

ARTICLE III. DEPARTMENTS

SECTION 1. The Association shall consist of the following Departments: Major Seminary, Minor Seminary, College and University, School Superintendents, Secondary School, Elementary School, and Special Education. Other departments or sections may be added with the approval of the Executive Board of the Association.

SECTION 2. Each department or section within a department, although under the direction of the Executive Board, retains its autonomy and elects its own officers. There shall, however, be nothing in departmental or sectional regulations inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution or the Bylaws adopted in pursuance thereof.

SECTION 3. It shall be the responsibility of the President of each Department to report to the Executive Secretary the time, place, and proposed program of all regional meetings.

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The officers of the Association shall be a President General; Vice Presidents General to correspond in number with the number of Departments in the Association; an Executive Secretary; and an Executive Board. In addition to the above-mentioned officers, the Executive Board shall include three members from each department—the President and two other members specifically elected to represent their department on the Executive Board.

SECTION 2. All officers shall hold office until the end of the annual meeting wherein their successors shall have been elected, unless otherwise specified in this Constitution.

ARTICLE V. THE PRESIDENT GENERAL

SECTION 1. The President General shall be chosen annually in a general meeting of the Association.

SECTION 2. The President General shall preside at general meetings of the Association and at the meetings of the Executive Board. Meetings of the Executive Board shall be called at the discretion of the President General and the Executive Secretary or whenever a majority of the Board so desires.

ARTICLE VI. THE VICE PRESIDENTS GENERAL

SECTION 1. The Vice Presidents General, one from each Department, shall be elected in the general meeting of the Association. In the absence of the President General, the Vice President General representing the Major Seminary Department shall perform the duties of the President General. In the absence of both of these, the duties of the President General shall be performed by the Vice Presidents General representing the other Departments in the following order: Minor Seminary, College and University, School Superintendents, Secondary School, Elementary School, and Special Education. In the absence of the President General and all Vice Presidents General, a *pro tempore* Chairman shall be chosen by the Executive Board on nomination, the Secretary putting the question.

ARTICLE VII. THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

SECTION 1. The Executive Secretary shall be elected by the Executive Board. The term of his office shall be three years, and he shall be eligible to re-election. He shall receive a suitable salary in an amount to be fixed by the Executive Board.

SECTION 2. The Executive Secretary shall be resource officer of the general meetings of the Association and of the Executive Board. He shall receive and keep on record all matters pertaining to the Association and shall perform other duties consonant with the nature of his office.

SECTION 3. The Executive Secretary shall be the custodian of all moneys of the Association. He shall pay all bills authorized under the budget approved by the Executive Board. He shall give bond for the faithful discharge of these fiscal duties. His accounts shall be subject to annual professional audit and this audit shall be submitted for the approval of the Executive Board.

SECTION 4. Whenever the Executive Secretary, with the approval of the President General, finds that the balance in the checking account maintained by his office is in excess of the short-term requirements of the account, he is authorized to deposit the excess funds in savings accounts of well-established banks or building and loan associations; provided only that the amount on deposit with any one such institution shall not exceed the amount covered by Federal Deposit Insurance.

ARTICLE VIII. THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

SECTION 1. As mentioned in Article IV, the Executive Board shall consist of the general officers of the Association therein enumerated together with the Presidents of the Departments and two other members elected from each Department of the Association.

SECTION 2. The Executive Board shall determine the general policies of the Association. It shall supervise the arrangements for the annual meetings

of the Association.

SECTION 3. It shall have charge of the finances of the Association. The expenses of the Association and the expenses of the Department and Sections shall be paid from the Association treasury, under the direction and with the authorization of the Executive Board.

SECTION 4. It shall have power to regulate admission into the Association, to fix membership fees, and to provide means for carrying on the work of the Association.

SECTION 5. It shall have power to form committees to facilitate the discharge of its work. It shall authorize the auditing of the accounts of the Executive Secretary. It shall have power to interpret the Constitution and regulations of the Association, and in matters of dispute its decision shall be final. It shall have power to fill all interim vacancies occurring among its members until such vacancies can be filled in the annual elections.

SECTION 6. The Executive Board shall hold at least one meeting each year.

ARTICLE IX. MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Under the direction of the Executive Board, anyone who is desirous of promoting the objects of this Association may be admitted to membership on payment of membership fee. Memberships shall be institutional or individual. Payment of the annual fee entitles the *individual* member to copies of the general publications of the Association issued after admission into the Association but not to departmental publications. Payment of the annual fee entitles the *institutional* member to copies of the general publications of the Association issued after admission into the Association and to publications of the department of which the institution is a member. The right to vote in Departmental meetings is determined by the regulations of the several Departments.

SECTION 2. Benefactors of the Association shall be individuals, institutions, or organizations interested in the activities of Catholic education who contribute one thousand dollars or more to its financial support.

SECTION 3. Individuals interested in the activities of the Association who contribute an annual fee of twenty-five dollars or more shall be Sustaining Members of the Association.

ARTICLE X. AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1. This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members present at an annual meeting, provided that such amendment has been approved by the Executive Board and proposed to the members at a general meeting one year before.

ARTICLE XI. BYLAWS

SECTION 1. Bylaws not inconsistent with this Constitution may be adopted at the annual meeting by a majority vote of the members present and voting; but no Bylaw shall be adopted on the same day on which it is proposed.

1. The Executive Board shall have power to fix its own quorum, which shall not be less than one-third of its number.

2. Publications of the Departments may be distributed only to institutional members of the Departments.

INDEX

- Academic Facilities Bill of 1963, Catholic Colleges and the, *Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J.*, 155
- Administrators, Staff Utilization—Implications for, *Philip R. Pitruzzello*, 280
- Advanced Summer Schools for High School Students: The Program at Clayton High School, St. Louis, *Rev. Gerald R. Sheahan, S.J.*, 290
- African Development, Education and, *Hon. G. Mennen Williams*, 221
- Aggiornamento of Seminaries, The, *Rev. Peter Riga*, 89
- Altmann, *Matthew*, Understanding the Interracial Question: An Element in Sister Formation, 173
- Approaches to the Old Testament for High School Catechists and Students, *Rev. Aldo J. Tos*, 262
- Ashley, *Very Rev. Benedict W., O.P.*, Modern Science and the Relevance of Scholastic Philosophy, 54
- Ball, *William B.*, Federal Aid—1954, 228
- Behavioral Sciences Can Make in Seminary Training, The Contribution, *Rev. Andrew M. Greeley*, 47
- Bible Devotions and National Needs, *Anthony Mullaney, O.S.B.*, 165
- Bier, *Rev. William C., S.J.*, The Guidance Counselor and the Spiritual Director: The Distinct Role of Each, 112
- Blind, The Educational and Social Needs of the, *Rev. Thomas J. Carroll*, 353
- Burghardt, *Rev. Walter J., S.J.*, The Intellectual Formation of the Future Priest, 58
- Burns, *Bro. Germanus, C.S.C.*, Modern Youth and the Vocational Challenge, 381
- Butler, *Rev. Richard E., O.P.*, The Cultural Contribution of the Newman Apostolate to Secular Higher Education, 148
- Carroll, *Rev. Thomas J.*, The Educational and Social Needs of the Blind, 353
- Castro Cuba and Latin America, *James B. Donovan*, 308
- Catholic Colleges and the Academic Facilities Bill of 1963, *Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J.*, 155
- Catholic Education and National Needs, *Most Rev. John J. Dougherty*, 23
- Catholic Education, A Progress Report on the Study of, *Reginald A. Neuwein*, 318
- Catholic Lay People, Meeting of, 227
- Catholic Special Education—A National Need, *Most Rev. John J. Graham*, 338
- Catholic Teacher Education and Social Leadership, *Very Rev. William Ferree, S.M.*, 190
- Christ, The Mystery of, *Rev. Joseph D. Dillon*, 270
- Clayton High School, St. Louis, Advanced Summer Schools for High School Students at, 290
- College and University Department, membership of, 13; Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting, 213; officers, iv, 219
- College Entrance Policies, *R. M. Keefe*, 121
- Community and the Foreign Student, The, *Thomas Quigley*, 207
- Community Resources and Personnel, Use of, *Rev. Thomas J. Peterman*, 284
- Contribution of the Behavioral Sciences Can Make in Seminary Training, The, *Rev. Andrew M. Greeley*, 47
- Convention, Registration at the 1964 NCEA, xvi, fn., p. 11
- Coville, *Walter J.*, The Personality Assessment of Candidates for the Priesthood and the Religious Life, 396
- Cuba and Latin America, Castro, *James B. Donovan*, 308
- Cultural Formation of the Future Priest, The, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert C. Wolff*, 68
- Curriculum Advisory Committees, 298, 302
- Damiano, *Most Rev. Archbishop Celestine J.*, Sermon. Pontifical Dialogue Low Mass, 21; The Vocation Apostolate—An Integrated Effort, 368
- Daniel, *Sr. Mary, S.N.D. de N.*, Relating the Problem of Poverty in the Modern World to Spiritual Formation, 179
- D'Arcy, *Rev. Paul F., M.M.*, Differentiated Seminary Discipline, 85
- Deaf, Educational and Social Needs of the, *Peter J. Owsley*, 356
- De La Garza, *Rev. Peter*, The Needs of Foreign Students, 205

- De Prosop, Chris J.*, Programs for Training Teachers of the Mentally Retarded, 361
- Differentiated Discipline in the Seminary, *Rev. Eugene C. Kennedy, M.M.*, 79
- Differentiated Seminary Discipline, *Rev. Paul F. D'Arcy, M.M.*, 85
- Dillon, Rev. Joseph D.*, The Mystery of Christ, 270
- Discipline, Differentiated Seminary, *Rev. Paul F. D'Arcy, M.M.*, 85
- Discipline in the Seminary, Differentiated, *Rev. Eugene C. Kennedy, M.M.*, 79
- Donovan, Rev. Egbert H., O.S.B.*, The Newman Apostolate and the High School Graduate, 273
- Donovan, James B.*, Castro Cuba and Latin America, 308
- Dougherty, Rev. Anthony J., O.S.F.S.*, Educational TV—What One School Is Doing With Closed-Circuit Television, 291
- Dougherty, Most Rev. John J.*, Catholic Education and National Needs, 23
- Drinan, Rev. Robert F., S.J.*, Catholic Colleges and the Academic Facilities Bill of 1963, 155
- Duffy, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas P.*, A Positive View of Catholic Secondary Education in the Light of Today's Crisis, 253
- Education and African Development, *Hon. G. Mennen Williams*, 221
- Education on the Catholic Campus, The Realization of the Purposes of Catholic, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan*, 143
- Education—A National Need, Catholic Special, *Most Rev. John J. Graham*, 338
- Educational and Social Needs of the Blind, The, *Rev. Thomas J. Carroll*, 353
- Educational and Social Needs of the Deaf, *Peter J. Owsley*, 356
- Educational TV—What One School Is Doing With Closed-Circuit Television, *Rev. Anthony J. Dougherty, O.S.F.S.*, 291
- Elementary Education? What's New in Significant Research and Experimentation in Catholic, *Sr. Mary Richardine, B.V.M.*, 325
- Elementary School Department, membership of, 13; officers, viii, 336; Proceedings and Reports, 336
- English in the Catholic Secondary School, A Position Paper on, *Rev. James E. Farrell, S.J.*, Chairman, 298
- English and the Foreign Student, *Robert Lado*, 210
- Enrollments, Scheduling To Accommodate Large, *Bro. Laurentian Peter, F.S.C.*, 293
- Essential Role and Formation of the Teacher of High School Religion, The, *Rev. Joseph A. Novak, S.J.*, 260
- Executive Board, Meetings of the, 1
- Executive Secretary, Report of the, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt*, 13
- Federal Aid—1964, *William B. Ball*, 228
- Federal Government Programs on Catholic Graduate Schools, Impact: *Rev. Jerome J. Marchetti, S.J.*, 182
- Ferree, Very Rev. William, S.M.*, Catholic Teacher Education and Social Leadership, 190
- Financial Report for 1963, 417
- Finnegan, Rev. Darrell F. X., S.J.*, The Why and How of Organizing a Five-Year Program of Teacher Education, 184
- Five-Year Program of Teacher Education, The Why and How of Organizing a, *Rev. Darrell F. X. Finnegan, S.J.*, 184
- Foreign Language, Testing in, 302
- Foreign Student Advising on the Catholic Campus, *Rev. Gerard F. Yates, S.J.*, 200
- Foreign Student, The Community and the, *Thomas Quigley*, 207
- Foreign Student, English and the, *Robert Lado*, 210
- Foreign Students, The Needs of, *Rev. Peter De La Garza*, 205
- Formation of the Future Priest, The Cultural, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert C. Wolff*, 68
- Formation of the Future Priest, The Intellectual, *Rev. Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.*, 58
- General Meetings (Atlantic City, 1964), Minutes, 42
- Graduate Schools, Impact: Federal Government Programs on Catholic, *Rev. Jerome J. Marchetti, S.J.*, 182
- Graduate Study, Committee on, 182
- Graham, Most Rev. John J.*, Catholic Special Education—A National Need, 338
- Government Programs on Catholic Graduate Schools, Federal, Impact: *Rev. Jerome J. Marchetti, S.J.*, 182
- Greeley, Rev. Andrew M.*, The Contribution the Behavioral Sciences Can Make in Seminary Training, 47
- Guidance Counselor and the Spiritual Director: The Distinct Role of Each, The, *Rev. William C. Bier, S.J.*, 112

- Headquarters Administrative Staff, ix, 14
- Higher Education, The Cultural Contribution of the Newman Apostolate to Secular, *Rev. Richard E. Butler, O.P.*, 148
- Higher Education in Meeting National Needs, The Responsibility of American, *Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J.*, 134
- Higher Education, National Needs and American, *Francis Keppel*, 128
- High School Students: The Program at Clayton High School, St. Louis, Advanced Summer Schools for, *Rev. Gerald R. Sheahan, S.J.*, 290
- Horrigan, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F., The Realization of the Purposes of Catholic Education on the Catholic Campus, 143
- Housing and Education, The Interdependence of, *Robert C. Weaver*, 37
- How Catholic Schools Look to Parents: What the Public Should Know, *Mrs. Charles J. O'Neil*, 233
- Impact: Federal Government Programs on Catholic Graduate Schools, *Rev. Jerome J. Marchetti, S.J.*, 182
- Intellectual Formation of the Future Priest, The, *Rev. Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.*, 58
- Interdependence of Housing and Education, The, *Robert C. Weaver*, 37
- International Student Program, 200
- Interracial Question: An Element in Sister Formation, Understanding the, *Rev. William J. Kenealy, S.J.*, 167; *Matthew Ahmann*, 173
- John, Sr. Mary*, Moral, Religious, and Spiritual Formation of Students—A National Need, 162
- Johnson, Lyndon B., President: Letter from, 44
- Keefe, R. M.*, College Entrance Policies, 121
- Kenealy, Rev. William J., S.J.*, Understanding the Interracial Question: An Element in Sister Formation, 167
- Kennedy, Rev. Eugene C., M.M.*, Differentiated Discipline in the Seminary, 79
- Keppel, Francis*, National Needs and American Higher Education, 128
- Koob, Rev. C. Albert, O.Praem.*, Perspective on Catholic Education: What the Public Sees and Hears, 241
- Lado, Robert*, English and the Foreign Student, 210
- Latin America, Castro Cuba and, *James B. Donovan*, 308
- Layman and the Schools, The, *John W. McDevitt*, 29
- Leadership, Catholic Teacher Education and Social, *Very Rev. William Ferree, S.M.*, 190
- Lovette, Mrs. Charles H.*, The Mission of the Theresians, 411
- McAllister, Robert J.*, Preventive Mental Hygiene for Children, 342
- McDevitt, John W.*, The Layman and the Schools, 29
- Madden, Rev. John R.*, Pastoral Approach in the Vatican Apostolate, 390
- Major Seminary Department, membership of, 13; Minutes, 1964 meetings, 96; officers, iii, 102; Proceedings and Reports, 96
- Marchetti, Rev. Jerome J., S.J.*, Impact: Federal Government Programs on Catholic Graduate Schools, 182
- Mental Hygiene for Children, Preventive, *Robert J. McAllister*, 342
- Mentally Retarded, Programs for Training Teachers of the, *Chris De Prospe*, 361
- Minor Seminary Department, membership of, 13; officers, iii, 127; Proceedings and Reports, 126; resolutions, 126
- Mission of the Theresians, The, *Mrs. Charles H. Lovette*, 411
- Modern Science and the Relevance of Scholastic Philosophy, *Very Rev. Benedict W. Ashley, O.P.*, 54
- Modern Youth and the Vocational Challenge, *Bro. Germanus Burns, C.S.C.*, 381
- Moral, Religious, and Spiritual Formation of Students—A National Need, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Murphy*, 162; *Sr. Mary John, S.S.J.*, 162
- Morality of Psychological Testing of Vocation Prospects, The, *Rev. Robert Howard Sweeney, C.S.C.*, 370
- Mullaney, Antony, O.S.B.*, Bible Devotions and National Needs, 165
- Murphy, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F.*, Moral, Religious, and Spiritual Formation of Students—A National Need, 162
- Mystery of Christ, The, *Rev. Joseph D. Dillon*, 270
- National Catholic Educational Association: administrative staff, ix, 14; committees, 15; constitution and bylaws, 420; Executive Board Meetings, 1; financial report for 1963, 417; membership, 13; officers, iii; Report of the Executive Secretary, 13
- National Needs and American Higher Education, *Francis Keppel*, 128

- National Needs, The Responsibility of American Catholic Higher Education in Meeting, *Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert*, 134
- Needs of Foreign Students, The, *Rev. Peter De La Garza*, 205
- Neuwein, Reginald A.*, What Are the Facts? A Progress Report on the Study of Catholic Education, 318
- Newman Apostolate and the High School Graduate, The, *Rev. Egbert H. Donovan, O.S.B.*, 273
- Newman Apostolate to Secular Higher Education, The Cultural Contribution of the, *Rev. Richard E. Butler, O.P.*, 148
- Newman Education Section, membership of, 13; officers, v
- Novak, Rev. Joseph A., S.J.*, The Essential Role and Formation of the Teacher of High School Religion, 260
- O'Keefe, Sr. Maureen, S.S.N.D.*, The Sister in the Modern World, 409
- Old Testament for High School Catechists and Students, Approaches to the, *Rev. Aldo J. Tos*, 262
- O'Neil, Mrs. Charles J.*, How Catholic Schools Look to Parents: What the Public Should Know, 233
- Owens, Ralph*, Physical Fitness for National Strength, 314
- Owsley, Peter J.*, Educational and Social Needs of the Deaf, 356
- Pastoral Approach in the Vocation Apostolate, *Rev. John R. Madden*, 390
- Perseverance in the Seminary: Problems and Remedies, *Most Rev. John J. Wright*, 103
- Personality Assessment of Candidates for the Priesthood and the Religious Life, The, *Walter J. Coville*, 396
- Personnel, Use of Community Resources and, *Rev. Thomas J. Peterman*, 284
- Perspective on Catholic Education: What the Public Sees and Hears, *Rev. C. Albert Koob, O. Praem.*, 241
- Peter, Bro. Laurentian, F.S.C.*, Scheduling To Accommodate Large Enrollments, 293
- Peterman, Rev. Thomas J.*, Use of Community Resources and Personnel, 284
- Philosophy, Modern Science and the Relevance of Scholastic, *Very Rev. Benedict W. Ashley, O.P.*, 54
- Physical Fitness for National Strength, *Ralph Owens*, 314
- Piruzzello, Philip R.*, Staff Utilization—Implications for Administrators, 280
- Pope, Message from the, 43
- Positive View of Catholic Secondary Education in the Light of Today's Crisis, *A. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas P. Duffy*, 253
- Poverty in the Modern World to Spiritual Formation, Relating the Problem of, *Sr. Mary Daniel, S.N.D. de N.*, 179
- President Lyndon B. Johnson, Letter from, 44
- Preventive Mental Hygiene for Children, *Robert J. McAllister*, 342
- Priest, The Cultural Formation of the Future, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert C. Wolff*, 68
- Priest, The Intellectual Formation of the Future, *Rev. Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.*, 58
- Priesthood and the Religious Life, The Personality Assessment of Candidates for the, *Walter J. Coville*, 396
- Proceedings and Reports: Major Seminary Department, 96; Minor Seminary Department, 126; College and University Department, 213; School Superintendents Department, 244; Secondary School Department, 298; Elementary School Department, 336; Special Education Department, 367; Vocation Section, 415
- Programs for Training Teachers of the Mentally Retarded, *Chris J. De Prospro*, 361
- Psychological Testing of Vocation Prospects, The Morality of, *Rev. Robert Howard Sweeney, C.S.C.*, 370
- Quigley, Thomas*, The Community and the Foreign Student, 207
- Realization of the Purposes of Catholic Education on the Catholic Campus, The, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Alfred F. Horrigan*, 143
- Regional Units: College and University Department, 220; Secondary School Department, Annual Report of the, 304; members, 307
- Reinert, Very Rev. Paul C., S.J.*, The Responsibility of American Higher Education in Meeting National Needs, 134
- Relating the Problem of Poverty in the Modern World to Spiritual Formation, *Sr. Mary Daniel, S.N.D. de N.*, 179
- Religion, The Essential Role and Formation of the Teacher of High School, *Rev. Joseph A. Novak, S.J.*, 260
- Religious Life, The Personality Assessment of Candidates for the Priesthood and the, *Walter J. Coville*, 396
- Research and Experimentation in Catholic Elementary Education? What's New in Significant, *Sr. Mary Richardine, B.V.M.*, 325

- Resolutions: Minor Seminary Department, 126; Superintendents Department, 225, 247, 251
- Resources and Personnel, Use of Community, *Rev. Thomas J. Peterman*, 284
- Responsibility of American Catholic Higher Education in Meeting National Needs, *Very Rev. Paul C. Reinert, S.J.*, 134
- Retarded, Programs for Training Teachers of the Mentally, *Chris J. De Prospe*, 361
- Richardine, Sr. Mary, B.V.M.*, What's New in Significant Research and Experimentation in Catholic Elementary Education?, 325
- Riga, Rev. Peter*, The *Aggiornamento* of Seminaries, 89
- Scheduling To Accommodate Large Enrollments, *Bro. Laurentian Peter, F.S.C.*, 293
- School Superintendents Department: Associate Secretary's Remarks, 226; membership of, 13; Minutes of 1963 Annual Meeting, 244; Minutes of Executive Committee Meetings, 248, 249; Proceedings and Reports, 244; Report of Nominating Committee, 248; resolutions, 225, 251; officers, v, 252
- Science and the Relevance of Scholastic Philosophy, Modern, *Very Rev. Benedict W. Ashley, O.P.*, 54
- Secondary Education in the Light of Today's Crisis, A Positive View of Catholic, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas P. Duffy*, 253
- Secondary School Department, membership of, 13; officers, vi, 336; Proceedings and Reports, 298; Regional Units, 304
- Seminaries, The *Aggiornamento* of, *Rev. Peter Riga*, 89
- Seminary, Differentiated Discipline in the, *Rev. Eugene C. Kennedy, M.M.*, 79
- Seminary Discipline, Differentiated, *Rev. Paul F. D'Arcy, M.M.*, 85
- Seminary: Problems and Remedies, Perseverance in the, *Most Rev. John J. Wright*, 103
- Seminary Training, The Contribution the Behavioral Sciences Can Make in, *Rev. Andrew M. Greeley*, 47
- Sermon. Pontifical Dialogue Low Mass. *Most Rev. Archbishop Celestine J. Damiano*, 21
- Sheahan, Rev. Gerald R., S.J.*, Advanced Summer Schools for High School Students: The Program at Clayton High School, St. Louis, 290
- Sister Formation, 167-81; officers, v, 220
- Sister in the Modern World, The, *Sr. Maureen O'Keefe, S.S.N.D.*, 409
- Special Education—A National Need, Catholic, *Most Rev. John J. Graham*, 338
- Special Education Department, membership of, 13; officers, viii, 361; Proceedings and Reports, 367
- Spiritual Director: The Distinct Role of Each, The Guidance Counselor and the, *Rev. William C. Bier, S.J.*, 112
- Staff Utilization—Implications for Administrators, *Philip R. Pitruzzello*, 280
- Students—A National Need, Moral, Religious, and Spiritual Formation of, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. John F. Murphy*, 162; *Sr. Mary John, S.S.J.*, 162
- Summer Schools for High School Students: The Program at Clayton High School, St. Louis, Advanced, *Rev. Gerald R. Sheahan, S.J.*, 290
- Supervisors Section, membership of, 13; officers, vi, 252
- Sweeney, Rev. Robert Howard, C.S.C.*, The Morality of Psychological Testing of Vocation Prospects, 370
- Teacher Education, Section on, 184; Relationship of Section to the College and University Department, 198
- Teacher Education and Social Leadership, Catholic, *Very Rev. William Ferree, S.M.*, 190
- Teacher Education, The Why and How of Organizing a Five-Year Program of, *Rev. Darrell F. X. Finnegan, S.J.*, 184
- Teacher of High School Religion, The Essential Role and Formation of the, *Rev. Joseph A. Novak, S.J.*, 260
- Teachers of the Mentally Retarded, Programs for Training, *Chris J. De Prospe*, 361
- Testing in Foreign Languages: Summary of Report of Working Committee, 302
- Testing of Vocation Prospects, The Morality of Psychological, *Rev. Robert Howard Sweeney, C.S.C.*, 370
- Theresians, The Mission of the, *Mrs. Charles H. Lovette*, 411
- Tos, Rev. Aldo J.*, Approaches to the Old Testament for High School Catechists and Students, 262
- TV, Educational: What One School Is Doing with Closed-Circuit Television, *Rev. Anthony J. Dougherty, O.S.F.S.*, 291

- Understanding the Interracial Question: An Element in Sister Formation, *Rev. William J. Kenealy, S.J.*, 167; *Matthew Ahmann*, 173
- Use of Community Resources and Personnel, *Rev. Thomas J. Peterman*, 284
- Vocational Challenge, Modern Youth and the, *Bro. Germanus Burns, C.S.C.*, 381
- Vocation Apostolate—An Integrated Effort, The, *Most Rev. Celestine J. Damiano*, 368
- Vocation Apostolate, Pastoral Approach in the, *Rev. John R. Madden*, 390
- Vocation Prospects, The Morality of Psychological Testing of, *Rev. Robert Howard Sweeney, C.S.C.*, 370
- Vocation Section, membership of, 13; officers, ix, 415
- Weaver, *Robert C.*, The Interdependence of Housing and Education, 37
- What Are the Facts? A Progress Report on the Study of Catholic Education, *Reginald A. Neuwein*, 318
- What's New in Significant Research and Experimentation in Catholic Elementary Education? *Sr. Mary Richardine, B.V.M.*, 325
- Why and How of Organizing a Five-Year Program of Teacher Education, The, *Rev. Darrell F. X. Finnegan, S.J.*, 184
- Williams, *Hon. G. Mennen*, Education and African Development, 221
- Wolff, *Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert C.*, The Cultural Formation of the Future Priest, 68
- Wright, *Most Rev. John J.*, Perseverance in the Seminary: Problems and Remedies, 103
- Yates, *Rev. Gerard F., S.J.*, Foreign Student Advising on the Catholic Campus, 200
- Youth and the Vocational Challenge, Modern, *Bro. Germanus Burns, C.S.C.*, 381

